

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-AUG-2000 16:39:42.00

SUBJECT: Re: Tuesday Lunch with SLDN

TO: twu@os.dhhs.gov (twu@os.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Just a reminder that I won't be there.

JB

Timothy Wu <twu@os.dhhs.gov>

08/04/2000 02:07:06 PM

Please respond to twu@os.dhhs.gov

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: "jblumenthal@whf.gov@inetgw2" <jblumenthal@whf.gov>,

"raaron@whf.gov@inetgw2" <raaron@whf.gov>

Subject: Tuesday Lunch with SLDN

Hey, All...

Since I got a generally very positive response, I have gone ahead and confirmed with C. Dixon Osburn, Co-Founder of Service Members' Legal Defense

Network, to speak with us at lunch on Tuesday, 8/8 from 12:00 - 1:30 p.m. at the Fellows Office.

This should be a very interesting session, in light of the Pentagon and DOD's

recent admission that there have been numerous violations of the military's enforcement of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," the most egregious of which was the beating death of Private Barry Wintchell last year. SLDN was the driving force in getting DOD to enforce the provisions of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," as

well as getting the military to institute safeguards to prevent anti-gay witch

hunts in the armed forces. SLDN is also in an interesting position because, as

a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization, it CANNOT seek to overturn the

government
policy; it can only act to protect those who are harmed by violations of
the
policy, and to advocate for fairer and more just enforcement measures. I
think that you'll find Dixon to be very articulate and well versed in the
issues on both sides, and not a single-issue driven person.

Please let me know if you cannot attend. I will send out a bio and
background on SLDN on Monday.

Tim

----- Original Message -----

All -

Please arrive no later than 2:45 today at the Pennsylvania Ave. entrance to
the Justice Department (mid-block between 9th and 10th) so that I can get
everyone cleared through security and up to the AG's Conference Room by
3:00.

Our total head count is now 12 (9 WHF, 3 Judicial Fellows). I look
forward to
a great session.

Chris

<http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/jreno.html>

----- End of Original Message -----

Message Sent

To:

Christopher.M.Moore@usdoj.gov

Daniel F. Feldman/NSC/EOP

"petenajera@aol.com@inetgw2" <petenajera@aol.com>

"benjamin-esther@dol.gov@inetgw2" <benjamin-esther@dol.gov>

"Gary.Hall@do.treas.gov@inetgw2" <Gary.Hall@do.treas.gov>

Jacqueline F. Lain/WHO/EOP

John B. Buxton/OPD/EOP

"Juan_Garcia@ed.gov@inetgw2" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov>

"azimk@ms.com@inetgw2" <azimk@ms.com>

"lance_wyatt@hotmail.com@inetgw2" <lance_wyatt@hotmail.com>

Melissa M. Goldstein/OVP/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com (GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-AUG-2000 14:48:42.00

SUBJECT: Gay Dems Call Log Cabin Endorsement of Bush Irresponsible

TO: GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com (GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

National Stonewall Democratic Federation
733 15th Street, NW Suite 700A
Washington, DC 20005
www.stonewalldemocrats.org

For Immediate Release
August 7, 2000

Contact: Daniel McGlinchey
(202) 246-8523

Contact: Michael Colby
(202) 783-8670

GAY DEMOCRATS CALL LOG CABIN ENDORSEMENT OF GOV. BUSH IRRESPONSIBLE

(Washington) Today the National Stonewall Democratic Federation, the national group of gay Democrats, expressed dismay at the endorsement of Gov. Bush by a national group of gay Republicans and urged gay and lesbian voters to carefully consider what standards were applied to justify the endorsement. Log Cabin Republicans announced its official endorsement of George W. Bush for president after a vote over the weekend at their annual meeting in Philadelphia.

Daniel McGlinchey, political director of National Stonewall Democrats, said, "George W. Bush opposes every single public policy proposal aimed at ending prejudice against gays and lesbians. Log Cabin claims to be a gay rights organization that opposes discrimination against gays and lesbians, and for them to support placing the entire executive branch, as well as control over federal judicial appointments, into the hands of a candidate who doesn't even think gays and lesbians should raise children and who supports criminalizing the private sexual activity of gay and lesbian adults is flatly indefensible."

National Stonewall Democrats noted that the Log Cabin endorsement of Bush contradicts Log Cabin own professed standards and ignores the civil rights issues that its leaders have said are most important. In its "Strategy 2000" election program, LCR declared "its unwavering commitment to hold every Republican presidential candidate accountable for his or her public

statements and positions of concern to our community."

"How has Log Cabin held Bush accountable for his opposition to ENDA, his support of anti-gay sodomy laws, his opposition to gay relationships, and for his support of the ban on openly gay people in the military?" said Michael Colby, executive director of the National Stonewall Democrats. "Apparently Log Cabin is so desperate to win the approval of the Republican party that they're willing to throw the fight for equality in order to get it."

National Stonewall noted that in an interview on Fox News last year, LCR executive director Rich Tafel outlined the priorities of his organization and stated that gay Republicans "put a greater emphasis on sodomy repeal and the military issue," referring to the current law banning openly gay people in the armed services. In a November 1999 Salon magazine interview, Tafel said, "If Bush doesn't think gays are fit to be parents, that would be a serious issue for an organization like ours." And, in an Open Letter to the Democratic National Committee dated April 15, 1999, Tafel called for Vice President Gore to state "his clear and unambiguous positions on gay adoptions, gay foster care and gay marriage -- immediately. We can't operate blindly with anyone, nor should any candidate -- Republican or Democrat -- get a free ride on these issues."

McGlinchey said, "I'm puzzled that Log Cabin would cite these issues as fundamental to our humanity and then give George W. Bush a free ride on all of them. Gov. Bush fails on every count. He doesn't think gay people should adopt children, and he opposes any recognition of gay relationships. He supports the terrible Don't-Ask-Don't-Tell military policy, and he even thinks the government should regulate the private sexual activity of gay and lesbian adults. By contrast, Gore believes gay people should have the right to adopt, he supports domestic partnership benefits for gay and lesbian Americans, he voted against an anti-gay sodomy law amendment in the Senate, and he supports allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military. The differences between Bush and Gore on gay and lesbian issues are so vast it should be an embarrassment to the Log Cabin Republicans, not an occasion for them to support a Republican presidential candidate whose only concrete promise so far is to not call us names."

The National Stonewall Democratic Federation is the national organization of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Democrats, with over 10,000 members and 55 affiliated clubs across the country. NSDF is committed to improving the record of the Democratic Party and educating voters about the vast difference that exists between the two major parties on issues of importance to our communities.

###

Paid for by the Democratic National Committee
For more information contact:
Mark Spengler Spengler@dnc.democrats.org

Unsubscribe or access your membership settings at:

<http://blast.liveonthenet.com:4000/GMG/ctrlpanel/0/31>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TASwann@aol.com (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-AUG-2000 11:33:49.00

SUBJECT: Morris Kight Lifetime Achievement Award

TO: TASwann@aol.com (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CALIFORNIA GAY VETERANS
MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

A Proud Member of the
California Alliance for Pride and Equality (CAPE);

MEDIA ADVISORY

TOM Swann
(760) 324-5670

FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 8 2000
MORRIS KIGHT COLLECTION DISPLAY, SILENT AUCTION, COCKTAILS 5:30 P.M.
AWARDS DINNER 7:00 P.M.
MARQUIS HOTEL
GRAND BALLROOM
PALM SPRINGS CA
\$50 per person
Contributions are tax-deductible

DINNER THEME:

A United Community Building California's
First Gay Veterans Memorial

The desert cake recognizes the 10th anniversary of the Gay, Lesbian and
Bisexual Veterans of America. There will be champagne at every table.
Also
an autographed leather bound edition of The Front Runner by honorary board
member Patricia Nell Warren will be auctioned to support the local Palm
Springs Gay Veterans.

LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD
(Award presenters are Sheila Kuehl and Maxine Waters)

Morris Kight, a veteran of civil rights and peace activism before
Stonewall.
He was instrumental in establishing the Gay and Lesbian community centers

in
Los Angeles, Orange County and elsewhere. He co-founded the Stonewall
Democratic Club of Los Angeles and was an adviser to President Jimmy
Carter.
Morris and late Supervisor Harvey Milk were instrumental in the defeat of
the
1978 Briggs Initiative. The Los Angeles Times describes Morris as:
Liberator!

SHEILA KUEHL LEADERSHIP AWARD
(Presented in person by Hon. Sheila Kuehl)

Herb King, a distinguished World War II veteran who invented canned rations
for the military. He is a two-time delegate to the Democratic National
Convention. In 1993 he was part of a nationwide bus tour to try and lift
the
military ban.

MAXINE WATERS AWARD FOR COURAGE
(Award Presented in person by Rep. Maxine Waters)

The Hon. Ron Oden, Palm Springs City Councilmember
Keynote Speaker California's first celebration of victory in WW II and
crusader for Domestic Partnership in Palm Springs.

PERRY WATKINS LEADERSHIP AWARD
(Award presented by Jim Darby of Chicago)

Pat Johansen, President League of Women Voters marched with gay veterans on
national TV in Veterans Day parade.

SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY AWARD
(Award presented by Chris Lenz)

Rev. David Pelletier, Pastor of Metropolitan Community Church held a candle
tribute for slain Army PFC Barry Winchell and has spoken out for gays in
the
military and an end to hate crimes.

ELECTED OFFICIAL OF THE YEAR AWARD
(Award Presenter Charlie Sharples)

The Hon. Gary Amy, Mayor of Cathedral City made history when he used his
Veterans Day keynote speech to honor both heterosexual and homosexual
veterans.

CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEY OF THE YEAR
(Award Presenter Tom Swann)

Jon W. Davidson, supervising attorney Lambda Legal Defense and Education
Fund
Inc. of Los Angeles. Jon was the attorney for Tom Swann's case as well as
many others. He was the keynote speaker at the Equality Begins at Home
Veteran's wreath-laying ceremony at the State Capitol.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TASwann@aol.com (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-AUG-2000 11:32:21.00

SUBJECT: Morris Kight Lifetime Achievement Award

TO: TASwann@aol.com (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CALIFORNIA GAY VETERANS
MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

A Proud Member of the
California Alliance for Pride and Equality (CAPE);

MEDIA ADVISORY

TOM Swann
(760) 324-5670

FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 8 2000
MORRIS KIGHT COLLECTION DISPLAY, SILENT AUCTION, COCKTAILS 5:30 P.M.
AWARDS DINNER 7:00 P.M.
MARQUIS HOTEL
GRAND BALLROOM
PALM SPRINGS CA
\$50 per person
Contributions are tax-deductible

DINNER THEME:

A United Community Building California's
First Gay Veterans Memorial

The desert cake recognizes the 10th anniversary of the Gay, Lesbian and
Bisexual Veterans of America. There will be champagne at every table.

Also

an autographed leather bound edition of The Front Runner by honorary board
member Patricia Nell Warren will be auctioned to support the local Palm
Springs Gay Veterans.

LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD
(Award presenters are Sheila Kuehl and Maxine Waters)

Morris Kight, a veteran of civil rights and peace activism before
Stonewall.
He was instrumental in establishing the Gay and Lesbian community centers

in
Los Angeles, Orange County and elsewhere. He co-founded the Stonewall
Democratic Club of Los Angeles and was an adviser to President Jimmy
Carter.

Morris and late Supervisor Harvey Milk were instrumental in the defeat of
the

1978 Briggs Initiative. The Los Angeles Times describes Morris as:
Liberator!

SHEILA KUEHL LEADERSHIP AWARD

(Presented in person by Hon. Sheila Kuehl)

Herb King, a distinguished World War II veteran who invented canned rations
for the military. He is a two-time delegate to the Democratic National
Convention. In 1993 he was part of a nationwide bus tour to try and lift
the
military ban.

MAXINE WATERS AWARD FOR COURAGE

(Award Presented in person by Rep. Maxine Waters)

The Hon. Ron Oden, Palm Springs City Councilmember
Keynote Speaker California's first celebration of victory in WW II and
crusader for Domestic Partnership in Palm Springs.

PERRY WATKINS LEADERSHIP AWARD

(Award presented by Jim Darby of Chicago)

Pat Johansen, President League of Women Voters marched with gay veterans on
national TV in Veterans Day parade.

SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY AWARD

(Award presented by Chris Lenz)

Rev. David Pelletier, Pastor of Metropolitan Community Church held a candle
tribute for slain Army PFC Barry Winchell and has spoken out for gays in
the
military and an end to hate crimes.

ELECTED OFFICIAL OF THE YEAR AWARD

(Award Presenter Charlie Sharples)

The Hon. Gary Amy, Mayor of Cathedral City made history when he used his
Veterans Day keynote speech to honor both heterosexual and homosexual
veterans.

CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEY OF THE YEAR

(Award Presenter Tom Swann)

Jon W. Davidson, supervising attorney Lambda Legal Defense and Education
Fund

Inc. of Los Angeles. Jon was the attorney for Tom Swann's case as well as
many others. He was the keynote speaker at the Equality Begins at Home
Veteran's wreath-laying ceremony at the State Capitol.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com (GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-AUG-2000 18:54:21.00

SUBJECT: Shalala Addresses Caucus

TO: GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com (GLVote2000@blast.liveonthenet.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Contact:

Mark Spengler -- (202) 258-1088

Corri Planck -- (213) 891-1875

U.S. SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES SHALALA ADDRESSED HIV/AIDS
ISSUES AT
DNC'S GAY & LESBIAN CAUCUS

DNC Chair Ed Rendell, U.S. Secretary of Commerce Norm Mineta, and U.S.
Representative Barney Frank Also Addressed Delegates

LOS ANGELES, Aug. 17, 2000 ? U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services
Donna Shalala discussed HIV/AIDS and gay and lesbian health care issues
with the more than 200 openly gay and lesbian delegates, elected officials
and special guests at the Democratic National Convention's (DNC) Gay and
Lesbian Caucus at the Wilshire Grand Hotel today.

?We have an impressive record of achievement on HIV and AIDS and gay and
lesbian health issues, but we have not done enough,? Shalala said. ?We
need to move gay and lesbian health into the mainstream.?

Shalala also discussed privacy issues with regard to health care and
health records.

?There are more federal protections for your Blockbuster card than for
your health records,? she said. ?There is nothing more fundamental to
protecting our civil rights than protecting our health care records.?

U.S. Secretary of Commerce Norm Mineta drew parallels between the
discrimination he experienced as a child in the Japanese-American
internment camps during World War II and the discrimination still faced by
the gay and lesbian community.

?We have got to be at the table, because if we are not, the issues closest
to our hearts won't be talked about,? Mineta said. ?The biggest
difference between Republicans and Democrats,? said Mineta, is that
Republicans only grudgingly tolerate inclusion. ?We don't want to be

tolerated. We want to be respected.?

U.S. Representative Barney Frank (D-MA), the most senior openly gay member of Congress, focused on the clear choice voters face this November.

?If you care about the rights of sexual minorities, the choices are between a man who has opposed us every step of the way, a man who has ignored us throughout his public career; and Al Gore, a man who is a leader who wants to use the law to protect us,? Frank said.

Frank also criticized the Log Cabin Republicans for their endorsement of Texas Governor George W. Bush.

?Their philosophy seems to be, ?We wish you?d be supportive of our issues, but we?ll be supportive of you regardless,?? he said. ?You don?t change behavior by endorsing it; you reinforce it.?

Democratic National Committee Chairman Ed Rendell urged caucus participants to let their communities know the real dangers of a Bush/Cheney administration, and to tell the truth behind the rhetoric and illusion of inclusion in Bush?s agenda of so-called ?compassionate conservatism.?

?Al Gore wants to build, not coast, on this administration?s achievements. We will pass ENDA, pass stronger hate crimes legislation and lift the ban on gays in the military,? Rendell said.

Governor Tom Vilsack (D-IA) and U.S. Representatives Carolyn Maloney (D-NY) and Jay Inslee (D-WA) also addressed the delegates. Linda Chavez-Thompson, executive vice president of the AFL-CIO, discussed the natural coalition between the labor movement and the movement for gay and lesbian civil rights.

?Workers are workers. It doesn?t matter what their beliefs are, or who their partners are,? Chavez-Thompson said. ?No one should have to suffer because of who they love.?

Today, speakers of gay and lesbian interest scheduled to address the Convention from the main stage include:

- ? Gloria Nieto, executive director of the People of Color AIDS Foundation and co-chair of the Gay and Lesbian Caucus
- ? Sheila Kuehl, openly lesbian member of the California State Assembly
- ? Openly gay U.S. Representative Barney Frank (D-MA)

There are more than 200 openly gay and lesbian delegates, alternates and committee members from more than 30 states taking part in the Convention, including nine members of the Platform Committee and one member of the Drafting Committee.

The gay and lesbian community represents at least four to six percent of the overall electorate and an even greater proportion of the Democratic electorate. Gays and lesbians represented seven percent of the voters

that re-elected President Clinton and Vice President Gore in 1996. That support is expected to increase for the 2000 elections.

-30-

Unsubscribe or access your membership settings at:
<http://blast.liveonthenet.com:4000/GMG/ctrlpanel/0/31>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-SEP-2000 08:48:00.00

SUBJECT: CNN Larry King Live, September 18, 2000

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheri L. Stockham (CN=Cheri L. Stockham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Valerie J. Owens (CN=Valerie J. Owens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael F. Goldfarb (CN=Rachael F. Goldfarb/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Sinoway (CN=Linda Sinoway/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fern Mechlowitz (CN=Fern Mechlowitz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliott H. Baer (CN=Elliott H. Baer/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Drew T. Gardiner (CN=Drew T. Gardiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig A. Minassian (CN=Craig A. Minassian/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristen A. Triggs (CN=Kristen A. Triggs/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Raj Adlakha (CN=Raj Adlakha/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Helen L. Langan (CN=Helen L. Langan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth E. Baylor (CN=Elizabeth E. Baylor/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Stockwell (CN=David B. Stockwell/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel R. Wilson (CN=Daniel R. Wilson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander N. Gertsen (CN=Alexander N. Gertsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
CNN Larry King Live
Aired September 18, 2000 - 9:00 p.m. ET

Rudy Giuliani Talks About Battling Cancer; Ollie North
and

Steve May Debate Gays in the Military; Charles Spencer
Shares His Family History

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight, he says his sister's marriage to Prince Charles made his family bit players in the soap opera fantasy spun around Britain's royals. Diana's brother Charles, ninth Earl of Spencer, joins us from New York.

But first, the Big Apple's mayor Rudy Giuliani has an update on his fight against cancer and some observations about the Clinton-Lazio Senate race.

Plus, reserve officer Steve May, who is gay and who fights an Army discharge. And Oliver North, radio talk show host, decorated Marine, backs the military's bid to boot him.

They are all next, on LARRY KING LIVE.

Not only is he a friend, but all of America is involved in the health of the mayor of New York, Rudy Giuliani. This is not a partisan thing, this is a matter of health. And last Friday, he underwent major treatment at Mount Sinai.

What happened, Rudy, what did you choose to do?

MAYOR RUDOLPH GIULIANI (R), NEW YORK CITY: What I chose to do was to, first of all, take hormone therapy, which will last for about eight months, that reduces the size of the prostate. And then on Friday morning, I went in for an operation in which they placed about 90 -- I think it was 92 seeds that emit radiation right inside the prostate, they do it with needles, they give you a local -- actually they give you a spinal, and it took about two hours.

I rested for about three hours, I got out of the hospital about 2:00 in the afternoon. And now I told the press if they get close to me I'm going to zap them, now I'm live and radioactive, and they're killing the cancer cells. And then I...

KING: Is this -- this is a decision you made in lieu of

surgery, right?

GIULIANI: Yes, I decided -- and there are a lot of options, and you know, when we have time I can go through all of them in as much detail as you want, but the one that I thought made the sense -- made the most sense for me, is the combination therapy which involves hormones, seeds, and then two months later I go back for five weeks of external radiation. So you -- essentially you have the seeds placed inside the prostate, that is radiation inside that kills the cancer, and then you have radiation from the outside, that hopefully accomplishes the same thing. And I brought along the seeds to show you. This is what they look like.

KING: Let me see them.

GIULIANI: Can you see them? There they are right there. They're little tiny pellets and they place them in the prostate with needles and, you know, it's an operation.

KING: Yes. Are you feeling pain during this?

GIULIANI: No, you are -- you have an anesthetic, I mean, it puts you to sleep from the waist down and you can hear some of the things that are going on, but it's totally painless in that sense, and then afterwards you have some irritation. I would describe it more as discomfort more than pain.

KING: And is there any different feeling now about you when you have radiation in you? In other words, does food taste different? Do you set off light bulbs?

GIULIANI: Well, I like to kid around about it. But no, there is no difference. I -- but I -- don't tell the people that cover my everyday daily press conference because I have them convinced that if they ask me a question I don't like I can turn around and zap them with my seeds and get them really good.

KING: Now, Joe Torre said when he heard about this he said, cut it out, get it out, he doesn't care what the aftermath would be, cut it

out. And I know you
had to think about that, and that of course, would seem
the absolute ultimate
thing to do. Why did you come out against surgery?

GIULIANI: I thought -- from my point of view, I thought
this worked better. I
thought the rates with seed therapy are just as good,
some of the side effects are
a little bit less. And I thought that I could just
handle it better and it would work
better, and it would be a better chance of killing the
cancer. But you know, I can
see people that opt for surgery, and then some people
just do external radiation,
and then some people just do implantation of seeds. I
thought doing the three
things, the hormones, the seeds, and then the external
radiation, would give me
the best chance of killing it no matter where it is.

KING: And as you know, Rudy, you have agreed to this, we
are going to do a
major show on prostate cancer, and you're going to be
our bellwether type
co-host of this as we delve into this disturbing disease
on -- that's on the
increase in America.

GIULIANI: It is. The good news is that there are many
therapies, meaning four
or five, that have either equal or very similar survival
rates and cure rates. The
bad news is there are a lot of choices to make. I mean,
there is no -- this is not
one of those things where surgery is definitely the
answer, seeds are definitely
the answer, external radiation, so you have to really do
some thinking, and with
doctors that you trust. And after I thought it out, it
seemed to me that this was
the best alternative for me.

KING: Well, we all wish you the best, we look forward to
seeing you in New
York.

GIULIANI: Thank you.

KING: Now, we'll talk a little politics before we meet
our -- get into our panel
discussions.

GIULIANI: Absolutely.

KING: I'm going to show you a soundbite of the debate last week between Hillary Clinton and Congressman Lazio, and then we'll get your thoughts. Watch.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (D), N.Y. SENATE CANDIDATE: He stands here and tells us that he is a moderate mainstream independent member of Congress -- well, in fact, he was a deputy whip to Newt Gingrich, he voted to shut the government down, he voted to cut \$270 billion from Medicare. He voted for the biggest education cuts in our history.

REP. RICK LAZIO (R-NY), SENATE CANDIDATE: Mrs. Clinton, you of all people shouldn't try to make guilt by association. Newt Gingrich isn't running in this race, I'm running in this race. Let's talk about my record.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: Rudy, barring this terrible thing that occurred and changed your life, you'd have been standing there. How did Rick do?

GIULIANI: I thought Rick did very well. I thought he did exactly what he had to do. I mean, she is nationally famous, world famous, he stood on the same platform with her. I think he debated more effectively than she did, I think he was more comfortable than she was. And I think he displayed a greater knowledge of New York issues, which you know, in all deference to Mrs. Clinton, she really doesn't understand New Yorkers, she's not from New York.

She turned at one point to the mayor of Buffalo and said something like, you know, "he understands the high cost of Medicaid," because she doesn't know that mayors don't pay for Medicaid; county executives do in New York. So, I mean, there are a lot -- I could give you 10 examples of that.

Rick is a very knowledgeable congressman, he's come from

the state of New
York, he's represented us, and I thought he displayed
it. And he was a little
aggressive, I probably would have been more aggressive
but -- given my
personality -- but you know, look, they are running for
the Senate, she is not in a
glass house. KING: Yes.

GIULIANI: I mean, she is running to represent a state
she doesn't know, doesn't
come from, he has a right to challenge her.

KING: It is -- is it a close race?

GIULIANI: Absolutely. I said that when I was in it. I
will say it again, this is
going to be a very, very close race. And this is a state
that can go either way, it
can go Republican, we have a Republican governor, a
terrific one, George
Pataki, we have two Democratic senators, very often
we've had a Republican
senator, Al D'Amato, Pat Moynihan, a Democratic senator
-- this is a state that
loves to split tickets, and it's going to be very, very
tight, and it -- the presidential
race will affect it, but not as much maybe as in some
states.

KING: So with Gore ahead, Lazio will need split
ticketing, right?

GIULIANI: Yes, but remember, back in '92, Bill Clinton
carried the state by over
a million votes, and D'Amato was re-elected by something
like 70,000 votes. So
this state -- you know, this state can swing by a
million votes, Republican to
Democrat.

KING: Rudy, we wish you nothing but the best of health,
we'll see you in a
couple of weeks.

GIULIANI: Thank you, Larry. Looking forward to it.

KING: Mayor Rudy Giuliani, the mayor of New York.

When we come back, our old friend Oliver North is here,
radio host, is the
co-host of his own television show as well; and Army
Reserve Lieutenant Steve
May, who's involved in a bit of a controversy. We'll

talk about that.

And then, the Earl of Spencer. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Joining us now in Phoenix, Arizona is Army Reserve Lieutenant Steve May. He is the openly gay member of the Arizona legislature. The Army has recommended honorable discharge, saying that he violated don't tell policy on homosexuality.

In Washington is Oliver North, the nationally syndicated radio host, columnist, TV host and a combat-decorated Marine.

To get you up to date, on Sunday a military panel recommended May's discharge. The panel of three colonels recommended honorable discharge. Army attorneys argued for a general discharge. May was on this show a little over a year ago.

Steve, you came out a long time ago. Why is this now a story? LT. STEVE

MAY, GAY RESERVIST FACING DISCHARGE: Larry, you're right. I actually came out when I first ran for public office in 1996, when I was an honorably discharged veteran and a private citizen. And the Army called me back into service in February of 1999, two and half years after I came out as gay man. So it's a little bit strange that they are prosecuting me for this now.

KING: Now what do you want? You want an honorable discharge and you want out of the reserves...

MAY: No.

KING: ... or you want to stay as a reserve?

MAY: No, not at all. I think I should stay as a reservist. That's my obligation to my country. I am still under an obligatory period until May 2001, and I intend to continue to serve in uniform with honor until that date.

KING: Ollie, what's the argument against that noble

gesture?

OLIVER NORTH, RADIO TALK SHOW HOST: Well, it's against the law, for

starters. I mean, we do have a law that's been in effect since 1994 that says, don't ask, don't tell. It's not, don't see, don't listen. I mean, and unfortunately Mr. May broke the law.

MAY: Well, Colonel North, you know that's not true. The fact of the matter is

that I was a civilian at the time that I told, and the Army broke its own law when it called me back into service, even though my private life was already public record.

NORTH: Well, I mean, first of all, Mr. May, what -- and you and I discussed this before, so we have to disclose that...

MAY: Right.

NORTH: ... but the reality of it is you should not expect, first of all, that the Army is immune to knowing what's going on in rest of the world. No. 2, we ought not to expect real-time response to every one of those disclosures. But the requirement...

MAY: But, Colonel, let's talk about...

KING: Hold on, let him finish, then you go.

NORTH: The requirement is -- the requirement is, Steve -- and you and I both know this and all of our viewers ought to know this -- the requirement is that you cannot, if you're a homosexual, under the policy that's been in effect since Bill Clinton was -- became president, the policy is you cannot disclose that you are a homosexual. If you do, you have to go. That's what you did, and you have to go.

MAY: Actually, that's not true.

NORTH: Pack your bags and go home. MAY: Well, that's not true, Colonel, and you know that. I didn't disclose it after I was in the service, I disclosed it while I

was not in the service. And the service called me back into duty. So it's really a little bit more complicated than you make it out to be.

NORTH: But this is why...

MAY: But sir, the real question is, what was the honorable thing to do? The fact is, in February of 1999, our nation was preparing go to war in Kosovo. I was fully capable serving as a peacekeeper or a combatant. My country called me back into uniform and I reported for duty. Would it have been better, in your opinion, if I shirked my duty to my country and refused to report? Would that have been the honorable course...

NORTH: Steve...

MAY: ... No, of course not.

NORTH: Steve, the fact of the matter is the reason why you are getting an honorable discharge instead of a convenience to government or a general discharge is because the Army screwed up by calling you back to active duty after you disclosed that you were a homosexual. The law is very clear in this. The law says you cannot be a declared homosexual in the ranks and continue to serve. You have to go.

KING: By the way, do you agree with the honorable part? Is that correct?

NORTH: Well, given that the Army screwed up -- and I'm not here to point fingers at the Army. My daddy was in the Army, I had a brother that was in the Army, and I served in the Marines, I've got another brother in the Navy. But the Army screwed up in this case. They should never have called him back.

KING: Therefore, it should be honorable, not...

NORTH: Sure, yes.

KING: All right, you agree with that. Why do you want to stay, Steve, with an organization that, because of what you did, whether circumstances when you

did it -- doesn't want you?

MAY: Larry, I'm proud to be part of this institution that I've been a part of for 11 years, and I've have been honored to lead American troops. The fact is I've been willing to give my life for my country and I continue to be willing to do so. But my life is no less worthy to give for my country just because of the person that I love. This policy is an insult to the American people.

NORTH: Steve...

KING: And every review of his said he was an exemplary officer.

NORTH: And I have absolutely no quarrel whatsoever with how well, Steve, you performed your duties. But the reality of it is that for the good order and discipline of the armed forces United States -- here we are, we're teaching young guys in every -- soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, in every branch of the service -- we're teaching them the laws of physics. We teach them ballistics, we teach them electronics, we teach them the most sophisticated sciences possible, and then we expect them -- we're going to ignore the laws of biology. Well, you can't do that.

The reason why the policy is -- and it's a bitter compromise, I'll be the first to admit it. And Steve's caught in the middle of it -- but that bitter compromise was the best you could get between the old policy of thou shalt not serve if you're a homosexual -- for very good reason...

MAY: Colonel...

NORTH: ... and don't ask, don't tell, which is that compromise. And we all agree it's a lousy compromise, Steve.

MAY: And I agree, Colonel, and you're right, it is a lousy compromise. But I'm wondering what biology has to do with serving your country in uniform?

NORTH: Well, let's deal with reality here. There are no private bedrooms in a

Marine battalion, an Army regiment, an Air Force squadron or a U.S. Navy ship.

The reason why...

MAY: But, Colonel, Colonel, I experienced...

NORTH: Let me finish, let me finish -- let me give you a little bit of my experience, young fellow. I did do 22 years.

MAY: But you're not a gay man, sir...

NORTH: No, you're right.

MAY: Sir, you're not a gay man serving, and I am.

NORTH: You're absolutely right about that. But let me make an observation.

When I found a homosexual Marine officer, I had him court-martialed and thrown out of the United States Marine Corps, because he accosted a young United States Navy sailor as a superior to an inferior.

MAY: And I have never done that.

NORTH: I understand that.

MAY: And, sir, I had many men -- sir, I had many men who did that to women in my own units when I was in active duty in the Persian...

NORTH: Well then they should have been thrown out as well.

MAY: And they were. But the point is exactly this, sir, we should punish people for conduct, and not speech. And my conduct has never once been questioned.

NORTH: Steve, here's the problem. And I say -- I want to go back to the laws of biology. The reality of it is the reason we give separate bunk spaces to women on Navy ships, the reason we have separate and segregated showers and heads, is so that temptation, the laws of biology, does not become overwhelming and we create even bigger problems than we already have today, given that this administration wants to use the military like a bunch of lab rats in a radical social experiment.

MAY: Sir, are you saying that if you and I shared a bedroom in the barracks that you would succumb to some strange laws of biology?

NORTH: No, I would strangle you Steve before you could get away with it. I'm saying...

MAY: What makes you think...

KING: No, let me get a break here. We'll come right back with Army Reserve Lt. Steve May and Oliver North.

And then we'll meet Charles Spencer, get his thoughts on this.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Lt. May, where does this stand right now? Is it A recommendation? Where are we?

MAY: Well, I have been recommended for an honorable discharge, and now I will appeal that first to my commanding general, then to the secretary of the Army. And I will also ask the president to intervene. And if I fail there, I will file an appeal in civilian court.

KING: Is it also true that they used tape of your appearance on this show against you?

MAY: Larry, you figured very prominently in the government's prosecution against me. It was rather interesting.

KING: I just found this out tonight. How?

MAY: Well, they felt that it was inappropriate that I come on your show and talk about what the Army has done to me and how the proceeding has gone. They were very frustrated. They felt that I in some way gave the Army a black eye and misled the American public, which is obviously not true and was easily disproven in a matter of minutes. But...

KING: Ollie, can we safely say...

NORTH: Can we safely say we're vulnerable when we come on the show with you? Yes, Larry.

KING: Can we safely say that at Normandy there are gay people under the ground?

NORTH: I have no doubt. I have no doubt that they've been there since the days of the revolution. Here's the problem, Larry -- and, Steve, you need to fess up on this, because what you're basically arguing for is a change in the policy that Bill Clinton tried to get through back in 1994...

KING: Through a Colin Powell recommendation and others.

NORTH: No, but Colin Powell recommended this policy called don't ask, don't tell as the compromise, because the policy had been, with good reason...

KING: But he supports it now.

NORTH: ... no homosexuals.

KING: He did the last time he was on this show, he supports it.

NORTH: Well, he does, but he also supports enforcement, which is why, Steve, your tenure in the Army is going to be abbreviated no matter how often you appeal. The reality of it is it's not don't ask, don't -- it is don't ask, don't tell, it's not don't see, don't listen -- and talk, even on this show.

MAY: Well, Colonel, there's actually a principal of constitutional law that's important, if that matters to you. And that is that the clause of speech -- the speech and debate clause in both the federal and Arizona Constitutions, which protects actions by a state legislator in the course of doing state legislative work. And the Army's investigation was initiated because of an action I took as a state legislator.

Further, McVeigh vs. Cohen established in federal court two years ago that all

the media appearances that I did subsequent to the illegal investigation can also not be used against me. And that was the entire military's case.

NORTH: But, Steve -- and I grant you there is -- I -- very, very important, you talk about the Constitution of the United States. You and I both took an oath to support and defend. I believe you did so honorably up to the point where you expect them to obviate the law itself, which the military can't do.

MAY: Well, actually, what...

NORTH: They made a mistake by calling you back on active duty.

MAY: And I agree.

NORTH: And so what ought to happen now, is you ought to take your honorable discharge and not try to work a change in policy that the Congress of United States doesn't support, even this commander in chief couldn't get through.

MAY: I'm not sure the Congress of the United States wouldn't support it now -- or maybe not in the next Congress. But I think also you should know, sir, that within the don't-ask-don't-tell statute, there is a provision -- actually, it's the Department of Defense instruction -- that says an officer can be retained for the good of the service. And that, we believe, is where my commanding general should take action to retain me.

NORTH: Steve, I would submit that the best thing you can do at this point in your career is to pack your bags, salute smartly, and say thanks for having the opportunity to serve.

KING: Something you do not intend to do, correct, Steve?

MAY: Absolutely not. Quite simply, the policy is immoral. The policy is wrong. I -- and I'm not going to just walk away from this without a stronger fight.

KING: I thank you both very much. Always good seeing

you, Steve.

MAY: Thanks, Larry.

KING: And, Ollie, I made you a star. Never forget, Ollie, never forget where it started.

NORTH: You did indeed, vulnerable as we all when we come on this show.

KING: Army Reserve Lieutenant Steve May and Oliver North. We thank them both for being with.

Charles Spencer, the Earl -- ninth Earl Spencer will be with us. He has got a book out called "A Personal History of an English Family."

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We now welcome to LARRY KING LIVE Charles Spencer. He is brother of Diana, the Princess of -- the late Diana -- Princess of Wales, the ninth Earl Spencer author of the new book, "The Spencers: A Personal History of an English Family." There you see its cover. It's always good to have him with us. He joins us from our bureau in New York.

What prompted the writing of this book, Charles?

EARL CHARLES SPENCER, PRINCESS DIANA'S BROTHER: Well, I grew up in the family home in Althorp in Northhampton in England. And I was surrounded all those years by all these portraits of my ancestors. And I was a tour guide, actually. I used to earn pocket money on the holidays as a teenager by taking people around, the visitors who used to come around.

And I guess the curiosity just got the better of me, Larry. I studied history at university. And I came to the stage where I just wanted to look back at what these people had really been like, what they had done, and to put it down in a book.

KING: Is it, for want of a better term, a little weird to be born royal?

SPENCER: Well, I'm not. So I wouldn't know. But I mean, I know that there is a difficult distinction for Americans. But I wasn't born royal. My sister married into the royal family.

KING: Well, I mean, as you have gotten to know them.

SPENCER: Well, I -- yes, I suppose getting to know them on a certain level. But really, this book is about an aristocratic English family. It's certainly not about the royal family, although they were a strong theme throughout the Spencer family history, I suppose.

KING: So this just your family. And then as it relates to royal, that would be through the marriage and the like.

SPENCER: Yes through the marriages and through service to the country -- I mean, rather like your two previous guests, a strong military connection, but also, political, and diplomatic as well.

KING: Where in the scheme of things is an earl?

SPENCER: An earl -- it's about midway in the English lords. There is four or five grades of lord. And the earl is the middle one. So I think there is about 50 of them in England. And I'm one of the younger ones, still.

KING: Is it fortunate to be born an earl?

SPENCER: Well, it is largely irrelevant now. In the year 2000, I don't think it means an awful lot. I mean, you asked me what an earl is. And I think a lot of English people just know it as something vaguely anachronistic. And really, I suppose that is part of the theme of this book. I have looked at the way that my family has always reflected the qualities and the values of their age.

And really, for the last 80 years, since the end of the first World War, the aristocracy in Britain hasn't meant an awful lot to

anybody. I mean, it's lost its
power and influence. And I only really use my title when
I'm at home, similar to
being CEO of a company. It's -- you know, that is what I
use there. But as an
author, I'm just Charles Spencer.

KING: All right, let's talk about Princess Di. What kind
of sister was she?

SPENCER: Wow, let's get straight in the deep end, Larry.
I -- in the fact, in the
book, I don't really cover her. And that's because I
don't want to cash in on that
aspect. But as a woman, she was a -- obviously a hugely
important world figure
in the late 20th century. Being a beautiful
humanitarian, I think she was in a
subset all of her own there.

But as a sister, well, I -- she was a great sister. I
was very fortunate to have
three wonderful sisters. And she is the one that the
public know all about. And
she had an immense appeal to the crowds who used to
flock to see her.

KING: Why do you not write about her as a sister? It is
called "A Personal
History of an English Family," so you tell us the whole
history. Wouldn't that
relationship between you and her be part of that?

SPENCER: Well, it could have been. It could have been if
that was the point of
the book. But really, this was more a history book. I
didn't want to intrude on
anything in the modern age, really. That wasn't the
point at all. I'm not here to --
I actually explain that in the book. I'm very happy to
put Diana in context.

I think it's important for people to see where she came
from, because, in fact, in
her moments of most deep distress, when the press were
really hammering her,
or her marriage was unraveling, or whatever, her
rallying cry to herself was
often: "Remember you are a Spencer." Well, I realized to
most Americans, they
don't know the first thing about the Spencer family.

But to her, it meant an enormous amount. Because like
me, she had grown up

with these portraits of ancestors who had done
reasonably good things.

KING: But you also realize, Charles, that the appeal you
would have, this book
would have, the interviews would have, would be centered
around fact of who
she was.

SPENCER: Absolutely right, Larry. And that is the point
I make in the book,
quite candidly, that books sales would be much less. But
I have no problem with
that, because, you know, I -- this is a book I'm very
proud of. And it's one I
would like to do well. And I believe people will enjoy
reading it. It is a good read.

KING: And you expect to be asked about your sister as
well.

SPENCER: I'm very aware that that is a common theme. It
is not the -- not
every interviewer does it. But everyone is entitled to
ask whatever question they
want. And I'm entitled to answer them as fully as I can.

KING: All right, we will cover a lot of bases -- her and
others, too -- with
Charles Spencer. The book is "The Spencers: A Personal
History of an English
Family."

We will also entertain your phone calls. And we will be
back right after this.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SPENCER: Diana was the very essence of compassion, of
duty, of style, of
beauty. All over the world, she was a symbol of selfless
humanity, a standard
bearer for the rights of the truly downtrodden, a very
British girl, who
transcended nationality, someone with a natural
nobility, who was classless, and
who proved in the last year that she needed no royal
title to continue to generate
her particular brand of magic.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SPENCER: On behalf of your mother and sisters, I pledge
that we, your blood
family, will do all we can to continue the imaginative
and loving way in which
you were steering these two exceptional young men, so
that their souls are not
simply amassed by duty and tradition but can sing openly
as you planned.

We fully respect the heritage into which they have both
been born and will
always respect and encourage them in their royal roles,
but we, like you,
recognize the need for them to experience as many
different aspects of life as
possible, to arm them spiritually and emotionally for
the years ahead. I know
would you have expected nothing less from us.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: Our guest is Charles Spencer. The book is "The
Spencers: A Personal
History of an English Family."

What was the effect on the family of your sister's
entrance into royalty?

SPENCER: Well, it was fairly major. I remember the day
that Diana got married
in '81, and we all assumed, the rest of the family
assumed, we'd just turn up for
the day and then go home, and life for us would carry on
as normal, because at
that stage nobody realized how huge Diana's appeal was
going to be
internationally and what -- I mean, she became possibly
the most famous woman
in the world, during her life -- the last half of her
lifetime.

And I remember that day very well and being there and
seeing my father bravely
walking Diana up the steps. And he did a great job,
because he had recently had
a stroke. And I remember all the different family
elements of the day. It was
grand pageant, and Diana looked stunning in her wedding
dress. I do remember
all of that. But at the same time, we were just, you
know, we were just part of
the chorus. We weren't some major part, and we just

assumed life would go
back to normal.

KING: But it did not?

SPENCER: It certainly did not. I mean, the media hunger
for Diana was so huge
throughout her public life that, really, she lost all
pretenses of privacy. And that
unfortunately continues during her death as well with
her own private secretary
going public with his memoirs.

KING: What do you make of that? Patrick Jephson is
writing a book called
"Shadows of a Princess." In fact, the queen and Prince
Charles have issued a
statement, "a matter of immense regret that Patrick has
decided to exploit for
personal profit his period of employment with the royal
family." How do you feel
about it?

SPENCER: Well, I fully agree with that statement,
really. I mean, you -- by
definition, he was a private secretary. He's not exactly
acting very honorably in
that role or as a man, and I think it's deeply
regrettable.

Also, I think the main -- well, the problem people have
in Britain with it is the
effect it's going to have on William and Harry. And, you
know, as their uncle, I
join in that. I mean, it is -- he's not thinking of
anything except his bank balance.

KING: By the way, do you get to see them, Charles?

SPENCER: I do, indeed. Yes, thank you, Larry.

KING: How are they doing?

SPENCER: They're both doing exceptionally well. And,
yes, I mean, I never
betray confidences at all, but, I mean, I stay in touch,
and they're doing -- I think
they're remarkable. They've come through the most public
tragedy, and they are
strong and well.

KING: Yes, they look it. Are you still a resident of
South Africa?

SPENCER: No, I've moved back to England now. I've got so many things on there, and I've lived there for the past year or so. But I did -- you're right -- I lived in Capetown for four years. But now I'm back as a resident of the U.K.

KING: You must miss Capetown, arguably the most beautiful city in the world. If it ain't the most beautiful, it ain't third or fourth either.

SPENCER: That's right. No, it's up there. It would be vying with Sydney, I imagine, which we are all seeing a lot of at the moment, as most beautiful city in the world. But I think Capetown has it over Sydney, because it's that much more compact and more beautiful.

KING: You were in Capetown when you learned of your sister's death, right?

SPENCER: That's quite right. I got a call in middle of the night, and at first it just was meant to be a car crash. And then everything -- and people had seen her walk away. And it escalated from there. But, you know, yes, that was a desperate night.

KING: What do you make of the Mohammed Al-Fayed suit against -- about the deaths, suing the United States government, as well, to release information upon which he believes how Diana's life was taken from her?

SPENCER: Well, you know, again, I mean, I have always felt sorry for Mr. Fayed for obviously sharing in the tragedy of losing his son there. But it would be much less painful for the rest of us, on our side, my family, if he could just bury all his conspiracy theories and let everyone move on.

KING: What do you make of your own and the other Spencers who have become tabloid fodder, that you're -- I know in the United States we don't go a month without you somewhere in one of the weekly tabloids. I imagine it occurs more often in Great Britain, maybe I'm wrong. How do you handle that?

SPENCER: Well, really, I mean, I look back at my family -- this has always been the case in a lesser way. I mean, we had -- one of the ancestors I wrote about is called Georgina Devonshire. She was the original tabloid fodder in England in the 1780s, and she...

KING: Really?

SPENCER: Yes, she kept 11 London newspapers alive just on her goings-on. I mean, she was quite an outrageous figure, I mean, she sold her kisses for votes, and she behaved in quite an unusual way. She was very high spirited -- I think that's a polite way putting it. So I suppose my family's always been used to being somewhere near the public eye. But obviously, the association with Diana has been in a different league to anything else.

KING: And how did you get termed "Champagne Charlie"?

SPENCER: Well, that's a child -- almost a childhood thing. I mean, that was from about 20 years ago. I think because my friends used to call me Charlie, and the British tabloids tried to think of something that went with that. And that's what they came up with, so here we are.

KING: You've also said that being a Spencer helped you get through all of this. How do you mean?

SPENCER: Well, I think if you're lucky enough to be able to draw on 500 years of family history and realize -- I mean, by reading this, I have realized how when I was researching the book how incredibly human my family was. I mean, I have always -- I was always brought up to think of them as these great achievers, and I must follow that line. But reading their letters, their diaries, they went through the same disappointments we all go through. And the fact that they're prominent means that their memories are preserved and their written records are preserved. But I think that the lesson of this book has always been -- has been for me that these are very, very human people.

I mean, I mentioned the portraits which I grew up
surround by. Now those
portraits were always painted when the men were at their
most powerful and
most splendid and the women were at their most
beautiful. But by going into the
research which I went into and reading these letters,
you get to learn that the
man who is very dashing in a military uniform ended up
being an incontinent
family embarrassment whose head was lolling around after
he had a stroke.

And I think that you draw strength. I mean, a lot of
people go back to their
roots. Genealogy is very popular in this country, I
know, in the United States,
and I think people want to know where they came from.
And by getting to know
your roots, you actually gain strength from that.

KING: We'll be right back with Charles Spencer. We'll
include your phone calls.

The book is available everywhere, "The Spencers: A
Personal History of an
English Family."

Angie Dickerson tomorrow night, and Governor Jessie
Ventura on Wednesday.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SPENCER: Of all the ironies about Diana, perhaps the
greatest was this: A girl
given the name of the ancient goddess of hunting, was,
in the end, the most
hunted person of the modern age.

She would want us today to pledge ourselves to
protecting her beloved boys,
William and Harry, from a similar fate. And I do this
here, Diana, on your behalf.
We will not allow them to suffer the anguish that used
regularly to drive to you
tearful despair.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: We're back with Charles Spencer. The book is "The
Spencers: A Personal
History of an English Family." We will include your

phone calls.

Tulsa, Oklahoma, hello.

CALLER: Hi.

KING: Hi. Go ahead.

CALLER: My question for Mr. Spencer is this: What is your current relationship with the boys? And do you spend much time with them?

SPENCER: Well, it is a fair question. And I'm here open to questions. But it is one area I really don't talk about in public, except I will reassure you that I do have contact with them, regular contact. And they are doing extremely well. But I -- beyond that, I'm sure the caller will understand, I -- you know, my role is one of being able -- I think they ought be able to confide in me.

And anything I say in public is going to compromise that position.

KING: Are they very Spencer-like? They are indeed half Spencers.

SPENCER: Well, I mean, that is not for me to judge, really. I mean, people have said that they look very like their mother. And I suppose, in that way, maybe. But, again, Larry, it's just so difficult for me to talk about them, because...

KING: I understand. We will respect that. SPENCER: Yes, OK.

KING: Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, hello.

CALLER: Hi, I have a question for Mr. Spencer.

KING: Sure.

CALLER: Well, first of all, I've got a comment. I just want to tell you how much I admire you and admired your sister, Princess Diana. And my question is: How does your family, the Spencer family, commemorate the anniversary of her death?

SPENCER: Well, what we did this year was -- we all did

our own thing. We --
my house in England is open in July and August to the
general public. And I
hasten to add, all profits go to Diana's memorial fund.
But on the 30th, we closed
the gates. And the 31st of August, as the caller may
know, is the anniversary of
Diana's death. And then the -- we have the flag half
mast.

And, it is -- I must admit, it's a very, very
overpowering day for me personally.
And I have noticed both the previous two years, I do
tend to go into quite a deep
depression. And that is really the way. I mean, it is --
you know, at the end of
the day, I know Diana was such a public figure, but she
was a sister, she was a
daughter, and she was a mother.

And it is difficult for people to remember that, I do
appreciate that. But it is a
very personal thing.

KING: Necedah, Wisconsin, hello.

CALLER: Hi, do you communicate with Prince Charles at
all, or the
grandparents, concerning your nephews?

SPENCER: Wow, we're on theme tonight, aren't we, really?
I respect Prince
Charles very much as the boys' fathers. And with the
grandparents -- well, my
mother is one of the grandparents. And, yes, very much
so. In fact, my mother
and I were both left by Diana in her will as guardians
-- not that that is really
relevant, because they still have a very active and able
parent looking after them.

But it did mean that Diana wanted to us have something
to do with their
upbringing in event of a tragedy. And it is a
responsibility that I'm sure all my
family take -- take very seriously.

KING: Charles, what do -- what do you think the effect
on you has been the fact
you are born with a title, that you are born with
property, that you are born with
money? Maybe it's very hard to self-examine that. What
is that like?

SPENCER: Well, it is a very good question, Larry, because it is a difficult one.

But I suppose I can hypothesize to a certain extent. I mean, if I was born without those things, I don't know. I mean, there would have been the odd advantage. But I have to be totally honest and say it has given me a fantastic head start in life. And it would be very spoiled for me to say otherwise.

I mean, I used to be very daunted by taking on the inheritance of the house at Althorp. I mean, I remember I was 5 when I first told that this was going to come my way. And it was so impossible for me as a little boy to see a house the size of a museum -- with the atmosphere then of a museum -- and think: That is going to be home.

It was a terrifying thought. It is a fantastic house. It is very grand. It's set in beautiful, beautiful English park land. And it has got wonderful art collection, some of it quite modern, and mostly of my family. And I just think, well, you know, it is a wonderful, wonderful place. And when we open it in July and August, people come from all over the world. We had over 10,000 Americans this summer.

And they remind me, when they speak to me, about how lucky I am. So I'm certainly not going to sit here and winch about it.

KING: No. How do you resist snobbery?

SPENCER: Well, I -- it's -- I reckon it's in the upbringing. And my parents made it very clear that you don't feel superior to somebody just because of your bloodline. You judge people for who they were. And then I think Diana demonstrated that. But it has been a common theme throughout my family's history. I mean, I look back on it, and we have always been left of center in terms of politics.

I mean, we have not been traditional establishment figures. And we never have been. And it's just the way it is. We have always been

very down to earth and
wanted to do our best, I think. I mean, that sounds
rather pious, but that is the
way it is.

KING: Spencers have generally voted Labor.

SPENCER: Well, no, they've -- well, they've generally
been liberal. When there
were two parties -- I suppose liberals would be similar
to your Democrats. But
they have been more Democrat than Republican in the
English sphere, yes.

KING: Going all the way back.

SPENCER: All the way back, yes. And, in fact, it has
ended us in a lot of
trouble. I mean, we have always been fiercely loyal to
the crown. Before our
own civil war, which was a couple hundred years before
yours, my family
fought very strongly for the rights of the people in
Parliament.

But when it actually came to civil war, when the people
-- when Parliament was
against the king, we reluctantly sided with the king,
because however great the
people's course was, my family felt we couldn't actually
draw our sword against
the king -- and actually ended up dying for the king for
a cause we didn't believe
in, which I think is one of the most extraordinary ways
to go: dying for a cause
you don't believe in.

I wouldn't want to do that. KING: We'll be back with
more of Charles Spencer
on this edition of LARRY KING LIVE right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: With Charles Spencer.

We go to North Kingstown, Rhode Island, hello.

CALLER: Thank you for taking my call.

KING: Sure.

CALLER: Mr. Spencer, could I have your honest opinion
about what you really
think of Camilla Parker Bowles? And also, do you think

your former
brother-in-law will ever marry her and become king?

SPENCER: Well, I have never met Camilla Parker Bowles.
And I have no opinion
on her. People who have met her say she is extremely
nice. And that is all I
know. And as for whether she should marry Prince
Charles, that is totally a
matter for them. It has nothing to do with me
whatsoever.

KING: Is he going be king?

SPENCER: I assume he will king. I mean, he is the heir.
And...

KING: Why not?

SPENCER: Exactly.

KING: Macon, Georgia -- hello.

CALLER: Hi, and thank you for taking my call.

KING: Sure.

CALLER: Certainly Princess Diana certainly had an impact
on so many things
worldwide, yet she had such a human element in the way
that she connected
with the common, everyday people. And what I would like
to ask you, sir, is
what are you doing to continue with that legacy that she
has left for us, and to
ensure that both of her sons continue to share in that
love and concern with
everyday people.

I commend you for everything that you're doing with the
book and just ask that
even as a resident here in Georgia, we got up at such an
early morning to watch
the funeral procession and how our hearts were just
touched and moved by...

KING: All right, there it is. What is the family doing
to continue that legacy,
Charles?

SPENCER: Well, I suppose the main thing I try and do is
-- I mean, people in
England say they haven't got anywhere to go to remember
Diana. And I've

turned over a large part of the estate to the exhibition of her life. And people come from all over the world to be -- we had 120,000 people came in July and August to see it. And we have hits on our Web site from all over the world, We had over 7,000 hits a day just from the States to look at it.

So my part in keeping the legacy alive is giving some -- giving somewhere where people can go as a focal point to Diana and where they can learn about her early life. We have silly footage there from her as a little girl. And that's what I want to do. And then we fund -- we give regular funds to her memorial fund, which gives money to the charities which the committee there thinks she would have supported.

And the activities at my house since Diana's death, we've raised over a million dollars for her funds, and I hope we'll continue to do that. And that's -- that's really my contribution, and I hope that's -- I hope that's enough.

KING: We'll take a break and be back with our remaining moments, get another call or two in, as well, for Charles Spencer.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Toronto, Canada, for Charles Spencer -- hello.

CALLER: Hello, Mr. Spencer. It's quite a personal honor for me to be able to speak with you this evening.

I wanted to ask you if, at the time that Diana was aware that she had problems with her marriage, was she able to speak with you? I know you were a great distance away, but was she able to speak with you and rely on you for support, yourself and your sisters in the family?

SPENCER: Well, I was living in England at the time, actually. I hadn't moved to South Africa. Yes, of course, I can remember these conversations where it

became clear there were problems. But, you know, I have
a great respect for the
privacy of people's marriage, even when one like that is
so public. And, you
know, you just give advice as a brother as you would to
any sibling who is going
through a very difficult patch.

And yet we were always there for Diana. And, you know,
we took the strain
sometimes, because out of all people in her life, we
were the ones she could
really, you know, chew our heads off, because we were
never going to say
anything. And -- but we were always there for her, and
we took it turns, really,
to be the one who could emotionally support her. You
know, it was -- she was
in a very, very pressurized position, and it wasn't
always easy.

KING: Charles, how are your sisters doing?

SPENCER: They're very well. That's very kind of you to
ask, Larry. They're
both doing extremely well. And I suppose, as is often
the case with such
tragedies, I think it's brought us even closer together.
I've always been very
close to my sisters, and we see each other far more now.
And I think when
you've lost someone that close, you appreciate whoever's
left. And, I mean,
now, for the first time in my life, in the past month or
so I have now become
older than Diana ever was, and that's a very, very odd
thought. She was always
my elder sister.

KING: What was first Earl of Spencer like?

SPENCER: He was OK, I mean, he was a -- he was the
richest man in the
kingdom at the time. And, in fact, his buckles on his
wedding shoes for the day
of his marriage were worth two million pounds or so, \$3
million die by today's
standards. And he got through money quite quickly and he
wasn't the most
responsible figure, but he was very romantic.

He got married secretly in the house at Althorp. It was
his 21st birthday, and so
he was able to follow his own destiny then, and he took

his childhood sweetheart
upstairs into one of the bedrooms there with his tutor,
who was a priest, and a
few very close members of the family. And they got
secretly married there. But
he was an OK guy, but he was very ill the whole time.
And I think that was a
problem. He was never a healthy man.

KING: Do we only have about a minute left? Do you have a
favorite Spencer in
all this history?

SPENCER: Yes, there's one slightly mad one who was in
the 19th century, and
he was told, look, you're the fourth son, and you've got
to do the traditional thing
and become a priest. And he shocked my family by
actually becoming deeply
religious. He became a monk, and he's two-thirds of the
way to becoming a
Catholic saint. And he was very unusual man. I mean, I
deeply respect him, but
at the time he was a severe family embarrassment because
he was just a bit too
religious.

KING: Yet on the way to being a saint...

SPENCER: Yes, the...

KING: ... while an embarrassment.

SPENCER: They thought of him as an embarrassment. But
today, I'm very
proud of him. And they considered him deeply eccentric,
which he was, but he
was a very, very genuinely good and sincere man. So he's
a bit of a hero in my
book.

KING: Charles, it's always great seeing you. I thank you
very much for joining
us, and best of luck with the book.

SPENCER: Larry, it's a pleasure. Thank you.

KING: One of the good guys, Charles Spencer, the brother of Diana,
princess of
Wales, the ninth Earl Spencer and the author of "The
Spencers: A Personal
History of an English Family."

Friday night's going to be very special around these

parts: Dick Van Dyke for an
hour with phone calls.

Tomorrow night, too: Angie Dickerson -- it's legends
week.

And on Wednesday night, Governor Jesse Ventura of
Minnesota, plus a big panel
discussing politics. We'll talk to Jesse, and then Jesse
will be part of the panel.

Thanks for joining us. For all of our guests, from
Washington, good night.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-SEP-2000 17:46:40.00

SUBJECT: Advocate interview

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karin Kullman (CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Mary, I hate to throw this to you after your weekend of non-stop work, but can you coordinate with Jullian (Elizabeth) on the Qs below and have something by 1:00 pm tomorrow? Thanks and please coordinate with me if this deadline can't be met.

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 09/25/2000
05:44 PM -----

Jenni R. Engebretsen
09/25/2000 04:47:48 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Matthew Murguia/OPD/EOP@EOP, Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate interview

On Wednesday, the President will do an interview with The Advocate. Below, pls find a list of likely Qs. Julian had drafted some initial Q&A back when we were scheduled to do this interview first time around -- they have since updated their list of questions.

I have asked counsel for guidance on boy scouts.

Anna: can we get something from dpc on hate crimes? (see #7 below)

Matthew: can your shop do a Q&A to address the AIDS question? (see #13 below)

Julian: I think the remainder of the questions would be best addressed by you. Pls let me know if you'd like me to reach out to the nsc on "don't ask, don't tell" -- I know they have done guidance for on on this in the past.

Guidance requests for 3 pm Tues, pls.

thanks,

Jenni

----- Forwarded by Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:31 PM -----

Jennifer H. Smith
09/25/2000 04:14:54 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate interview

Jenni -

Here are the updated questions. They also wanted to add a question about the boy scouts. (Basically, how did the president feel about the requests that he resign his honorary title in the organization to protest their exclusion of gays?)

Beyond that, I think you have the necessary info for the briefing. Let me know if you need anything else.

----- Forwarded by Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:09 PM -----

Chrisbull2@aol.com
09/20/2000 10:13:52 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Advocate Questions for the President

Jennifer: Here they are.

The interview, which will run in Q & A format, will appear in Advocate issue # 826, which goes on sale in late November. The following are the outlines of questions for the Sept. 27 interview with President Clinton:

- 1.) Looking back over the last eight years, what are the most important changes you've seen, politically and culturally, for gays and lesbians?
- 2.) Barney Frank said recently that your legacy on gay rights is comparable to JFK's on race. What role did your administration play in creating those positive changes?

- 3.) Which changes might be undone politically and which are likely to be permanent?
- 4.) After the 1993 debate over gays in the military, you commented that you had "lost a lot of blood" during the battle. Looking back now, how do you feel about that early and dramatic episode in your presidency? How would you counsel future presidents to deal with the politics of "don't ask, don't tell"?
- 5.) The gay community was criticized during the military battle for not creating enough political support for lifting the ban. What are the strengths of the gay rights movement? How could it become a more effective political force?
- 6.) In 1995, you signed the Defense of Marriage Act. Do you think that Americans will ever come to the point where they find same-sex marriage acceptable? What's your view of same-sex marriage as opposed to domestic partnership legislation that confers some of the same rights and responsibilities?
- 7.) What was your first reaction when you heard about the Matthew Shepard murder? What is to be done about such violent hostility to homosexuals? Is hate crime legislation the best answer?
- 8.) Versions of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act has languished in Congress for years now even though polls show that Americans overwhelmingly favor such job protections for gays and lesbians. What's the best way to jump start the legislation?
- 9.) You have appointed scores of openly gay people to high level administration posts. What have you learned from them? What has the nation learned from gay activists?
- 10.) Can you talk about your own personal relationships with gays and lesbians, friendships that helped to shape your attitude about gays?
- 11.) During your political troubles with the GOP in the House, polls showed that gays and lesbians--along with African Americans--were among your staunchest supporters. How do you feel now about that support?
- 12.) Much like you, gays and lesbians are often the targets of unrelenting--and often quite personal--attacks from the right-wing in Congress and from religious conservative leaders like Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson. How has that experience enhanced your empathy for the plight of the victims of antigay discrimination?
- 13.) Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death

rates, how do political leaders maintain a sense of urgency about the goal of eradicating the disease?

14.) What's America's unfinished business on gay and lesbian equality?

Chris Bull
Washington Correspondent, The Advocate
(202) 588-5155
ChrisBull2@aol.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-SEP-2000 17:13:22.00

SUBJECT: Advocate interview

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

On Wednesday, the President will do an interview with The Advocate. Below, pls find a list of likely Qs. Julian had drafted some initial Q&A back when we were scheduled to do this interview first time around -- they have since updated their list of questions.

I have asked counsel for guidance on boy scouts.

Anna: can we get something from dpc on hate crimes? (see #7 below)

Matthew: can your shop do a Q&A to address the AIDS question? (see #13 below)

Julian: I think the remainder of the questions would be best addressed by you. Pls let me know if you'd like me to reach out to the nsc on "don't ask, don't tell" -- I know they have done guidance for on on this in the past.

Guidance requests for 3 pm Tues, pls.

thanks,
Jenni

----- Forwarded by Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:31 PM -----

Jennifer H. Smith
09/25/2000 04:14:54 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate interview

Jenni -

Here are the updated questions. They also wanted to add a question about the boy scouts. (Basically, how did the president feel about the requests that he resign his honorary title in the organization to protest their exclusion of gays?)

Beyond that, I think you have the necessary info for the briefing. Let me know if you need anything else.

----- Forwarded by Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:09 PM -----

Chrisbull2@aol.com
09/20/2000 10:13:52 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Advocate Questions for the President

Jennifer: Here they are.

The interview, which will run in Q & A format, will appear in Advocate issue

826, which goes on sale in late November. The following are the outlines of questions for the Sept. 27 interview with President Clinton:

- 1.) Looking back over the last eight years, what are the most important changes you've seen, politically and culturally, for gays and lesbians?
- 2.) Barney Frank said recently that your legacy on gay rights is comparable to JFK's on race. What role did your administration play in creating those positive changes?
- 3.) Which changes might be undone politically and which are likely to be permanent?
- 4.) After the 1993 debate over gays in the military, you commented that you had "lost a lot of blood" during the battle. Looking back now, how do you feel about that early and dramatic episode in your presidency? How would you counsel future presidents to deal with the politics of "don't ask, don't tell"?

5.) The gay community was criticized during the military battle for not creating enough political support for lifting the ban. What are the strengths of the gay rights movement? How could it become a more effective political force?

6.) In 1995, you signed the Defense of Marriage Act. Do you think that Americans will ever come to the point where they find same-sex marriage acceptable? What's your view of same-sex marriage as opposed to domestic partnership legislation that confers some of the same rights and responsibilities?

7.) What was your first reaction when you heard about the Matthew Shepard murder? What is to be done about such violent hostility to homosexuals? Is hate crime legislation the best answer?

8.) Versions of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act has languished in Congress for years now even though polls show that Americans overwhelmingly favor such job protections for gays and lesbians. What's the best way to jump start the legislation?

9.) You have appointed scores of openly gay people to high level administration posts. What have you learned from them? What has the nation learned from gay activists?

10.) Can you talk about your own personal relationships with gays and lesbians, friendships that helped to shape your attitude about gays?

11.) During your political troubles with the GOP in the House, polls showed that gays and lesbians--along with African Americans--were among your staunchest supporters. How do you feel now about that support?

12.) Much like you, gays and lesbians are often the targets of unrelenting--and often quite personal--attacks from the right-wing in Congress and from religious conservative leaders like Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson. How has that experience enhanced your empathy for the plight of the victims of antigay discrimination?

13.) Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, how do political leaders maintain a sense of urgency about the goal of eradicating the disease?

14.) What's America's unfinished business on gay and lesbian equality?

Chris Bull
Washington Correspondent, The Advocate
(202) 588-5155
ChrisBull2@aol.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-SEP-2000 19:09:04.00

SUBJECT: Re: Advocate interview

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Can you coordinate with Jullian?

Mary L. Smith

09/25/2000 06:38:01 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

bcc:

Subject: Re: Advocate interview

which ones should I work on --not all of them I hope

Anna Richter

09/25/2000 05:46:38 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Subject: Advocate interview

Mary, I hate to throw this to you after your weekend of non-stop work, but can you coordinate with Jullian (Elizabeth) on the Qs below and have something by 1:00 pm tomorrow? Thanks and please coordinate with me if this deadline can't be met.

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 09/25/2000
05:44 PM -----

Jenni R. Engebretsen

09/25/2000 04:47:48 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Matthew Murguia/OPD/EOP@EOP, Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate interview

On Wednesday, the President will do an interview with The Advocate. Below, pls find a list of likely Qs. Julian had drafted some initial Q&A back when we were scheduled to do this interview first time around -- they have since updated their list of questions.

I have asked counsel for guidance on boy scouts.

Anna: can we get something from dpc on hate crimes? (see #7 below)

Matthew: can your shop do a Q&A to address the AIDS question? (see #13 below)

Julian: I think the remainder of the questions would be best addressed by you. Pls let me know if you'd like me to reach out to the nsc on "don't ask, don't tell" -- I know they have done guidance for on on this in the past.

Guidance requests for 3 pm Tues, pls.

thanks,
Jenni

----- Forwarded by Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:31 PM -----

Jennifer H. Smith
09/25/2000 04:14:54 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate interview

Jenni -

Here are the updated questions. They also wanted to add a question about the boy scouts. (Basically, how did the president feel about the requests that he resign his honorary title in the organization to protest their exclusion of gays?)

Beyond that, I think you have the necessary info for the briefing. Let me know if you need anything else.

----- Forwarded by Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:09 PM -----

Chrisbull2@aol.com
09/20/2000 10:13:52 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Advocate Questions for the President

Jennifer: Here they are.

The interview, which will run in Q & A format, will appear in Advocate issue

826, which goes on sale in late November. The following are the outlines of questions for the Sept. 27 interview with President Clinton:

- 1.) Looking back over the last eight years, what are the most important changes you've seen, politically and culturally, for gays and lesbians?
- 2.) Barney Frank said recently that your legacy on gay rights is comparable to JFK's on race. What role did your administration play in creating those positive changes?
- 3.) Which changes might be undone politically and which are likely to be permanent?
- 4.) After the 1993 debate over gays in the military, you commented that you had "lost a lot of blood" during the battle. Looking back now, how do you feel about that early and dramatic episode in your presidency? How would you counsel future presidents to deal with the politics of "don't ask, don't tell"?
- 5.) The gay community was criticized during the military battle for not creating enough political support for lifting the ban. What are the strengths of the gay rights movement? How could it become a more effective political force?
- 6.) In 1995, you signed the Defense of Marriage Act. Do you think that Americans will ever come to the point where they find same-sex marriage acceptable? What's your view of same-sex marriage as opposed to domestic partnership legislation that confers some of the same rights and responsibilities?
- 7.) What was your first reaction when you heard about the Matthew Shepard murder? What is to be done about such violent hostility to homosexuals? Is hate crime legislation the best answer?
- 8.) Versions of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act has languished in Congress for years now even though polls show that Americans overwhelmingly favor such job protections for gays and lesbians. What's the best way to

jump
start the legislation?

9.) You have appointed scores of openly gay people to high level administration posts. What have you learned from them? What has the nation learned from gay activists?

10.) Can you talk about your own personal relationships with gays and lesbians, friendships that helped to shape your attitude about gays?

11.) During your political troubles with the GOP in the House, polls showed that gays and lesbians--along with African Americans--were among your staunchest supporters. How do you feel now about that support?

12.) Much like you, gays and lesbians are often the targets of unrelenting--and often quite personal--attacks from the right-wing in Congress and from religious conservative leaders like Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson. How has that experience enhanced your empathy for the plight of the victims of antigay discrimination?

13.) Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, how do political leaders maintain a sense of urgency about the goal of eradicating the disease?

14.) What's America's unfinished business on gay and lesbian equality?

Chris Bull
Washington Correspondent, The Advocate
(202) 588-5155
ChrisBull2@aol.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-SEP-2000 18:38:02.00

SUBJECT: Re: Advocate interview

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

which ones should I work on --not all of them I hope

Anna Richter

09/25/2000 05:46:38 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP@EOP

Subject: Advocate interview

Mary, I hate to throw this to you after your weekend of non-stop work, but can you coordinate with Jullian (Elizabeth) on the Qs below and have something by 1:00 pm tomorrow? Thanks and please coordinate with me if this deadline can't be met.

----- Forwarded by Anna Richter/OPD/EOP on 09/25/2000
05:44 PM -----

Jenni R. Engebretsen

09/25/2000 04:47:48 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Matthew Murguia/OPD/EOP@EOP, Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Advocate interview

On Wednesday, the President will do an interview with The Advocate. Below, pls find a list of likely Qs. Julian had drafted some initial Q&A back when we were scheduled to do this interview first time around -- they have since updated their list of questions.

I have asked counsel for guidance on boy scouts.

Anna: can we get something from dpc on hate crimes? (see #7 below)

Matthew: can your shop do a Q&A to address the AIDS question? (see #13

below)

Julian: I think the remainder of the questions would be best addressed by you. Pls let me know if you'd like me to reach out to the nsc on "don't ask, don't tell" -- I know they have done guidance for on on this in the past.

Guidance requests for 3 pm Tues, pls.

thanks,
Jenni

----- Forwarded by Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:31 PM -----

Jennifer H. Smith
09/25/2000 04:14:54 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Advocate interview

Jenni -

Here are the updated questions. They also wanted to add a question about the boy scouts. (Basically, how did the president feel about the requests that he resign his honorary title in the organization to protest their exclusion of gays?)

Beyond that, I think you have the necessary info for the briefing. Let me know if you need anything else.

----- Forwarded by Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP on
09/25/2000 04:09 PM -----

Chrisbull2@aol.com
09/20/2000 10:13:52 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Advocate Questions for the President

Jennifer: Here they are.

The interview, which will run in Q & A format, will appear in Advocate issue

826, which goes on sale in late November. The following are the outlines of questions for the Sept. 27 interview with President Clinton:

- 1.) Looking back over the last eight years, what are the most important changes you've seen, politically and culturally, for gays and lesbians?
- 2.) Barney Frank said recently that your legacy on gay rights is comparable to JFK's on race. What role did your administration play in creating those positive changes?
- 3.) Which changes might be undone politically and which are likely to be permanent?
- 4.) After the 1993 debate over gays in the military, you commented that you had "lost a lot of blood" during the battle. Looking back now, how do you feel about that early and dramatic episode in your presidency? How would you counsel future presidents to deal with the politics of "don't ask, don't tell"?
- 5.) The gay community was criticized during the military battle for not creating enough political support for lifting the ban. What are the strengths of the gay rights movement? How could it become a more effective political force?
- 6.) In 1995, you signed the Defense of Marriage Act. Do you think that Americans will ever come to the point where they find same-sex marriage acceptable? What's your view of same-sex marriage as opposed to domestic partnership legislation that confers some of the same rights and responsibilities?
- 7.) What was your first reaction when you heard about the Matthew Shepard murder? What is to be done about such violent hostility to homosexuals? Is hate crime legislation the best answer?
- 8.) Versions of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act has languished in Congress for years now even though polls show that Americans overwhelmingly favor such job protections for gays and lesbians. What's the best way to jumpstart the legislation?
- 9.) You have appointed scores of openly gay people to high level administration posts. What have you learned from them? What has the nation learned from gay activists?
- 10.) Can you talk about your own personal relationships with gays and lesbians, friendships that helped to shape your attitude about gays?
- 11.) During your political troubles with the GOP in the House, polls showed that gays and lesbians--along with African Americans--were among your staunchest supporters. How do you feel now about that support?

12.) Much like you, gays and lesbians are often the targets of unrelenting--and often quite personal--attacks from the right-wing in Congress and from religious conservative leaders like Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson. How has that experience enhanced your empathy for the plight of the victims of antigay discrimination?

13.) Because of the advances in AIDS treatments and the decline in death rates, how do political leaders maintain a sense of urgency about the goal of eradicating the disease?

14.) What's America's unfinished business on gay and lesbian equality?

Chris Bull
Washington Correspondent, The Advocate
(202) 588-5155
ChrisBull2@aol.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TASwann@aol.com (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-SEP-2000 18:24:40.00

SUBJECT: DEMOCRATIC VETERANS CAUCUS NEWS

TO: TASwann@aol.com (TASwann@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From the Desk of
TOM SWANN, Chair
VETERANS CAUCUS
California Democratic Party

"A rising tide lifts all the boats"

--President John F. Kennedy, 1960 campaign

My Fellow Democrats:

I hope and pray this newsletter finds you happy and well. Today I want to share with you some exciting news about our caucus. I feel our veterans are providing the enthusiasm, the rising tide of activism that will lift up each and every candidate and will carry the entire Democratic Party ticket to victory in November. We have the only chartered Democratic Party Veterans Caucus in America. We are working hard for Democrats and Veterans. Here is A summary of our recent work:

CALIFORNIA ROLLOUT OF VETERANS FOR GORE-LIEBERMAN

The roll out of veterans who support Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will be Monday, October 16. Dave Roberts, California Desk Coordinator of Veterans for Gore and our Caucus Treasurer is working hard on this project. Dave said this morning that George Bush only had 93 names of veterans on his list a couple of weeks ago. We hope to have over 1,000 names. The national rollout is planned to be in St. Louis. We are planning multiple rollouts here in California in conjunction with the national rollout. The largest will be in Los Angeles at Patriotic Hall on the 8th floor at 10:00 a.m. We also hope to have rollouts in Santa Barbara, Sacramento and Palm Springs.

You can place your name on the rollout of Veterans for Gore-Lieberman by completing this form:

California Rollout of Veterans for
Gore-Lieberman

The pledge form is below. It needs to go to Tom Keefe via fax (number is below) or e-mail at Veterans@gorenet.com

Veterans for Gore/Lieberman

I, hereby

(print name)

pledge my support to Al Gore for President of the United States. I give my permission to the Gore/Lieberman campaign to release this information to the press and public.

Signature:

Retirement Rank:

Organization Affiliation/Military Awards/Honors:

Address:

City: State: CA Zip:

Work Phone: Home Phone:

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Please fax this form to (615) 340-3160

Or mail to:

601 Mainstream Drive

Nashville, TN 37228

Paid for by Gore/Lieberman, Inc.

NEXT CAUCUS BOARD MEETING

Saturday, October 7, 4:00 PM at the home of Caucus Treasurer Dave Roberts, 209 La Barranca Drive, Solana Beach, 858-793-0079. (Directions: I-5 south toward San Diego, exit Lomas Santa Fe and turn left toward Rancho Santa Fe. Turn left at second traffic light on Via Mil Cumbres. First Right onto Cerro Largo Drive. First right onto La Barranca.) Dinner at 6:00 P.M.

SEDALIA SANDERS FOR STATE SENATE - 37th DISTRICT

The Veterans Caucus announced today it is sending \$500 to this targeted campaign. This is the highest Priority State Senate race the veterans have in California this election now that it appears Sheila Kuehl and others are in great shape. Sedalia spoke at the organizational meeting of the Veterans

Caucus. She gave a great speech at the union Marquis Hotel regarding a veteran's memorial in the desert area. Sedalia will fight for veterans and seniors. She represents a strong voice of leadership and fairness in Sacramento.

Our veterans need Sedalia Sanders in the State Senate.

Saturday, October 7

6-8 p.m.

Four Seasons Buffet and Grill

100 N. Imperial

El Centro CA

Contact 760-352-7823

www.sanders2000.org

BUSH SAYS HE WILL CARRY CALIFORNIA

Texas Governor George Bush said last night he will carry California this November. Speaking on Larry King Live, Bush pointed out he now trails Gore by only 6% in the crucial Golden State. Veterans Caucus Vice Chair Roberts Braden of Chico said today he looks forward to working closely with Art Torres, Jim Clarke, Bob Mulholland and others in a united effort to ensure the Northern California roll out of Veterans for Gore-Lieberman in Sacramento

October 16 is a huge success. Roberts is also chair of the State Party Senior Caucus. He proposed that the Veterans Caucus present an Honorary Membership Award to Vice President Gore at a town hall meeting in California.

We need to make sure the veterans know that Al Gore carried an M-16 rifle in Vietnam.

OCTOBER 13 FUNDRAISER FOR BOB FILNER

Featuring Rep. Nancy Pelosi. More details later.

DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD

Tom Swann and Julie Alley recently attended the all-day Dept. of Veterans Affairs Community Advisory Board meeting. A total of 24 veteran health care advocates met with VA Medical Doctors to discuss the good and bad of VA medical care. The VA budget for medical research has been cut while the NIH research budget has doubled. Tom Swann is leading the national effort to see that dental care is provided to veterans living with HIV. Swann said, "The

President has made it clear he wants veterans living with HIV to have access to dental care. This has been one of our top objectives since 1996. The Clinton legacy is at stake here. I am confident Acting, VA Secretary Herschel Gober will give this matter his top priority attention." Mr. Gober opened the Community Advisory Board session with an electrifying speech. He said he loves to come to work at the VA every morning because he knows he is helping veterans. Mr. Gober outlined the great achievements of the VA in the past 8 years. (In our next newsletter we hope to have a summary of the improvements at the VA in the past 8 years.)

HERSHEL W. GOBER RECEIVES HONORARY MEMBERSHIP

By far the most admired and respected Veterans Secretary this century, the Hon. Hershel W. Gober, received an Honorary Membership Award Plaque in the California Democratic Party Veterans Caucus. There were several veterans in Mr. Gober's office that overlooks The White House who attended the ceremony. Mr. Gober said he was pleased to accept the award in recognition that this administration has opened more VA outpatient clinics and done more to help veterans than any in history.

So far the Veterans Caucus has presented Honorary Membership Award Plaques to James Carville, Assembly Speaker Antonio Villaraigosa and Mr. Gober. The caucus expects to present an award to Vice President Al Gore Jr. in the very near future to make sure all veterans know that Al Gore is OUR BEST CHOICE to be the next Commander-In-Chief.

TOM SWANN PROMOTED TO KENTUCKY COLONEL

Marine Corps Sergeant Tom Swann received a surprise promotion August 28. Governor Paul E. Patton promoted Swann to the rank of Kentucky Colonel. The Governor and Secretary of State sign the promotion. The award was presented to Swann who organized the first and only chartered Democratic Party Veterans Caucus in America. The Chair of the Democratic National Committee already told Swann it would be good to have a Veterans Caucus at the DNC level. The organizational meeting to establish a DNC Veterans Caucus will be in Louisville next Spring.

WHITE HOUSE MEETS WITH VETERANS CAUCUS

Members of the Veterans Caucus met recently at the White House to discuss a

proposed change in Pentagon policy that will enhance readiness. Swann said this was NOT a partisan event - the caucus was invited so we could educate our members about a proposed policy change that hopefully will take effect by December 1. Swann said the briefing emphasized in his mind that the military is in the best shape ever and readiness is at the highest level in history.

KAREN JOHNSON JOINS VETERANS CAUCUS

Karen Johnson, vice president of the National Organization for Women (NOW) became the second high-profile leader living outside California to join the California Democratic Party Veterans Caucus. The Veterans Caucus is hoping to be a sponsor of the national rally to stop violence against women October 15 in Washington D.C. The other high-profile veterans caucus member is Dr. Mike Rankin of the Presidential Advisory Council on HIV and AIDS.

Until a DNC Veterans Caucus is formed - veterans across America are encouraged to join the California Democratic Veterans Caucus. Dues are \$15 and should be made payable to:

CDP Veterans Caucus
39360 Peterson Road Space 100
Rancho Mirage CA 92270

The 250th dues-paying member gets a free lunch with State Party Secretary Jim Clarke, who recently attended his Coast Guard Academy reunion. Thank you Commander Clarke.

NIGHTMARE ON SOUTHWEST FLIGHT FOR VETERANS

Julie Alley was returning from Washington, DC where she represented the veterans of the Golden State at the Dept. of Veterans Affairs Community Advisory Board. This dedicated woman has been a member of Long Beach NOW and the Democratic Party for many years.

Sadly on the connecting flight 1317 from Nashville to Ontario she was treated like a second class citizen. This in despite of her heroic efforts in our nation's capital on behalf of veterans seeking better health care.

Julie has several food allergies and is on disability. She asked the flight attendant for club soda but instead received Sprite. After 2 sips she became very ill. The flight attendant poked fun at her illness by holding the bag of peanuts and reading off the ingredients like corn syrup etc. to see what else she was allergic too. Then at the conclusion of the flight he got on the public address system and thanked everyone for using Southwest and then

said he had tried to poison the woman in the front row. This incident caused great humiliation to Julie who remains very sad and ill from this episode. Southwest has offered no apology. Tom Swann said that witnessing this incident broke his heart and he hopes someone out there will offer assistance.

OCTOBER 16 PRESIDENT CLINTON - SCHIPSKE FUNDRAISER

President Clinton will appear at a Monday October 16 lunch fundraiser with Veterans Caucus Founding Member Gerrie Schipske. The Veterans Caucus has already targeted the Schipske race and sent \$1,000 for her campaign. The caucus has submitted a request to send a full color guard and have Tom Swann lead the pledge of allegiance according to Adjutant Jay Morales. The Veterans Caucus is also holding the Los Angeles roll out of veterans for Gore-Lieberman before the Schipske fundraiser so we can encourage veterans to leave the roll out and head down to Long Beach. Contact Schipske Campaign www.schipske4congress.org

CHENEY CONTINUES TO BE A NATIONAL EMBARRASSMENT

Republican Vice Presidential nominee Dick Cheney continues to dodge questions by Gay and Lesbian veterans regarding the Pentagon fiasco about gays having access to classified information that took place during his tenure as Defense Secretary. Cheney defended his decision to have gay staff members with access to classified information in a 1990 live TV appearance on "This Week with David Brinkley." However, the Defense Secretary failed to issue any written orders with this sweeping reform of the security regulations. Consequently when he left office, all gays who "came-out" at the Pentagon including Tom Swann were subject of witch-hunts. The first order of business by the Clinton-Gore administration was to appoint a working group to rewrite the Department of Defense (DOD) security regulations especially access to classified information. The President signed an Executive Order fixing the Cheney mess.

Under Dick Cheney's tenure as Defense Secretary, sexual harassment of women in the military was sky-high. The Veterans Caucus has submitted a request to Dave Roberts that women veterans for Gore play a role in the opening ceremony at the October 15 Washington DC rally sponsored by NOW.

PRESIDENT CLINTON SUPPORTS VETERANS MEMORIAL

President Clinton used the actual 25th anniversary of gay Air Force Sgt. Leonard Matlovich's cover story in Time magazine to issue his first letter praising LGBT veterans.

80th AD candidate Joey Acuna read the letter September 8 in Palm Springs. The fundraising dinner was the largest one-night event in the history of the LGBT Veteran civil rights movement. Copies of the historic letter have been hand-delivered to Acting, VA Secretary Hershel Gober, the secretary of the GLBVA and the President of New York Gay veterans. Governor Gray Davis proclaimed September 8 Morris Kight Day in California. Rep. Bob Filner placed the Sheila Kuehl Leadership Award to Herb King in the Congressional Record. Sheila Kuehl received a standing ovation from about 150 people at the union Marquis Hotel that attracted numerous non-gay veterans including the Naval (retired) Aviators Association. Walter Cole presented the Maxine Waters Award for Courage to Congressional candidate Ron Oden and held off awards to Tom Swann and Morris Kight for later.

President Clinton's record of supporting veteran memorials is widely known. He is the FIRST President to place a wreath at Arlington Tomb of the Unknowns each and every Veteran's Day and Memorial Day during his two terms in office.

He began work on the long overdue World War II Memorial. The Veterans caucus contact for the World War II Memorial is Corresponding Secretary Bob Handy who can be reached at Bobcdp10@rain.org

OCTOBER 25 WOMEN OUTREACH

The Veterans Caucus will discuss at the October 7 board meeting a request to cosponsor a Women Voters Outreach program in Long Beach. This event is being put together by the Long Beach National Organization for Women. The 7-9 p.m. event at CSULB includes State Senator Betty Karnette and congressional candidate Gerrie Schipske. More details will be published later.

SEN. FEINSTEIN MESSAGE TO VETERANS

Sen. Feinstein wanted to thank all of the veterans that have sent her get well cards. She recently had surgery on her broken leg and is recovering fine. She looks forward to getting back on the campaign trail soon. She hopes to attend or send a representative to the October 16 roll out of veterans. You can reach the Feinstein 2000 Campaign at 10350 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 250 Los Angeles CA 90025 or 310-229-2999. ID # C00315176

FROM THE MAIL BAG

Thank you San Francisco County Supervisor Gavin Newsom for that card of best wishes to our veterans.

Congratulations to Cathedral City Councilmember Greg Pettis for that outstanding September 16 fundraiser. Greg has been targeted for defeat by the far-right (so-called) Christian coalition. This openly gay crusader for

civil rights needs financial help from anywhere people in America value justice. Greg will be honored by veterans to kickoff Palm Springs Pride Thursday, November 2. If you want to roast or toast Greg contact Tom Swann.

To ask Greg about his campaign contact EaglePS@aol.com

Tom Santos is a great veteran running for congress in the Sacramento area. Send your best contributions to this great leader. Contact Ts4congress@aol.com

Congratulations to veterans Fred Bilodeau. Charlie Sharples and others in Palm Springs for the successful candidate's forum September 28.

In our next newsletter look for an exciting story on veteran Ray Quinto who looks like a sure winner in the 65th AD out in Riverside County. Speaker Hertzberg will be thrilled on Election Day when the Democrats pick up this seat in the Assembly.

Bob Handy is proposing a joint caucus session with the Lesbian and Gay caucus at the next E-Board meeting in San Francisco December 8-10. Bob has a guest speaker from UCSB (Dr. Aaron Belkin) who will discuss his recent study of gays in the military in foreign countries where it has worked well.

Tom Swann will attend the American Legion Post 8 meeting at Patriotic Hall Thursday October 5. The guest speaker will be the leader of California American Legion Women.

Veterans Caucus board members order cards at union Econo printing 760-770-2850

THE NEXT ISSUE will be published soon. Send your story to TASwann@aol.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: jmcleghorn@sldn.org (Jeffery M. Cleghorn) (jmcleghorn@sldn.org (Jeffery M. Cleghorn) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-2000 15:59:23.00

SUBJECT: RE: TDRL

TO: Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Matthew,

We very much like the idea of a friendly meeting very soon. In addition to the parties you mentioned, we suggest HRC (they attended the first meeting on the TDRL removal problem w/us a while ago) and NGLTF (just to make sure they don't get hurt feelings by being left out?).

We are very flexible on a date, Stacey and I can meet most any time.
Please
just let us know.

Again, the TDRL matter is the piece that SLDN can most effectively speak to.
We, by virtue of our DADT mission, gather some other HIV related military information and are happy to discuss what we learn from the field. I should stress, however, that we aren't HIV experts and don't want to misrepresent our abilities in this complicated area...

Thanks much. Have a good weekend!

Jeff

~~~~~  
Jeffery M. Cleghorn, J.D.  
Legal Associate  
Servicemembers Legal Defense Network  
PO Box 65301 ~ Washington DC 20035-5301  
202.328.3244 ~ fax 202.797.1635  
jmcleghorn@sldn.org ~ http://www.sldn.org

Thank you for supporting SLDN!

~~~~~

-----Original Message-----

From: Matthew_Murguia@opd.eop.gov [mailto:Matthew_Murguia@opd.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2000 1:34 PM
To: jmcleghorn@sldn.org
Subject: Re: TDRL

DoD/ Health Affairs is willing to attend a friendly meeting (Dr. Mazzuchi, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs would be attending), to discuss the all of the things we have been working on.

Do you have a date (s) in mind?

Also, who do you think should be there?

(my list includes SLDN, GLBVA, rep. from the Pres. Adv. Council on HIV, AIDS Action and NAPWA. Any others?)

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-OCT-2000 09:32:57.00

SUBJECT: CNN, Larry King Live--Oct 10, 2000

TO: Douglas J. Band (CN=Douglas J. Band/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Grace E. Yu (CN=Grace E. Yu/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander N. Gertsen (CN=Alexander N. Gertsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel R. Wilson (CN=Daniel R. Wilson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Stockwell (CN=David B. Stockwell/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Drew T. Gardiner (CN=Drew T. Gardiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth E. Baylor (CN=Elizabeth E. Baylor/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliott H. Baer (CN=Elliott H. Baer/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fern Mechlowitz (CN=Fern Mechlowitz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Helen L. Langan (CN=Helen L. Langan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Sinoway (CN=Linda Sinoway/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael F. Goldfarb (CN=Rachael F. Goldfarb/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Raj Adlakha (CN=Raj Adlakha/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Valerie J. Owens (CN=Valerie J. Owens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristen A. Triggs (CN=Kristen A. Triggs/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheri L. Stockham (CN=Cheri L. Stockham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig A. Minassian (CN=Craig A. Minassian/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Larry King Live

What Will Gore and Bush Do in Tomorrow's Debate?

Aired October 10, 2000 - 9:00 p.m. ET

FINAL THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS
FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight on LARRY KING LIVE, convicted
murderer
Kenneth Kimes holds a TV reporter hostage. How could
this happen in a
maximum security prison?

And then, will Al Gore and George Bush top last week's
performance tomorrow
night? We'll talk strategy with both camps, plus
pre-debate analysis with Senator
Fred Thompson, "The Washington Post's" Bob Woodward,
former Senate
Majority Leader George Mitchell, and presidential
historian Michael Beschloss.
All next, on LARRY KING LIVE.

We begin first with a story out of upstate New York. Our
guests are at our
studios in New York City, they are Henry Schleiff, the
chairman and CEO of
Court TV -- and we should tell you that Court TV is 50
percent owned by Time
Warner, the parent company of CNN -- and Mel Sachs, who
is the attorney for
the convicted Kenneth Kimes.

Henry, what happened today, you had a reporter there
doing what?

HENRY SCHLEIFF, CHAIRMAN & CEO, COURT TV: Well, one of
our
freelance reporters and producers, Maria Zone, was
participating as part of an
interview she was doing for one of our exclusive shows,
"Crime Stories," which
plays regularly at 10:00. As part of this interview --
we don't know factually
exactly when it happened, but at approximately 2:20 --
we don't know how far
into the interview, she was grabbed by Kenneth Kimes as
apparently there was a
break in the interview process.

She was grabbed, and with a pen that was either his or hers, pointed to her throat and subsequently to her eye and other life-threatening positions, held hostage for the next four hours until approximately 6:41 p.m., a prison negotiation team that was on site managed, fortunately, to get her released and safely so.

KING: How did this happen, Henry? I mean, this is a maximum security prison?

SCHLEIFF: It is a security prison, I don't know if it's maximum, I believe it is maximum security. It's the Clinton facility and I believe that is so. The actual -- whether the logistics in how he got this pen, how he grabbed her, we do know that there was a guard present, there was a camera crew, a small camera crew present, and the normal precautions were being taken. As I understand it, he was not shackled, he was not handcuffed. And as he was apparently going to the mens room, she was going to get a drink of water, they crossed momentarily, giving him an opportunity to grab her around the neck and threaten her with the pen.

KING: Did -- do you have the tape of the beginning of the interview?

SCHLEIFF: I don't know exactly what we have at this point, I have not spoken to Maria. She is still on site. Our major concern at this point, as you might expect, was not about the tape, but her personal safety.

KING: Now, Kenneth Kimes is a convicted murderer, the body was never found, this was the -- he and his mother both convicted of killing an aged socialite woman. You were doing what with him, by the way? What was the purpose of why Maria was there?

SCHLEIFF: It was a follow-up interview. She had had one non-camera, non-crew interview with him earlier. We were doing a follow-up to the actual trial and conviction as part of a "Crime Stories." It's a documentary series, as

you may know, that we play regularly at 10:00 that looks, in this case, at the follow-up, and we wanted to have his views and what was going on in his mind.

KING: How -- when was she released, how many hours later?

SCHLEIFF: It was about 4 hours and 20 minutes. She was taken hostage at 2:20 and she was released at 6:41 p.m.

KING: Before we talk with Mel Sachs, who is Kenneth Kimes' attorney, here is a brief shot of when I interviewed Kenneth Kimes at Rikers Island before he was sent to that prison. Watch.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

KING (on camera): Why would you do this?

KENNETH KIMES, CONVICTED MURDERER: Well, Larry, I don't think that's a fair interjection. It's...

KING: No?

KIMES: I did not do this. I did not commit this crime. I was arrested at the Hilton, there were no eyewitnesses, there was no physical evidence, I have no motive to commit this -- another incident.

KING: I know. I'm trying to figure out what was your motive, what was the motive the prosecution believed.

KIMES: I think that would be...

KING: They believed...

(CROSSTALK)

KIMES: They said that we wanted to rob the house. They said we wanted to steal the mansion. For the love of...

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: OK, Mel Sachs, what do you make of what happened with your client today?

MEL SACHS, KIMESES' ATTORNEY: I'm saddened, Larry, that this happened.

There wasn't any indication the Kenneth Kimes would in any way do anything

like this. Fortunately, Maria Zone is well and she is safe. That of course, is the

priority, but there wasn't anything to show that he would act in this way. In fact,

his conduct, Larry, has always been one of a gentleman, courteous, soft-spoken,

decent. You spent time with him and I probably spent more time with him than

any one else during the course of the case.

KING: Was he -- during the four hours did he ask for anything, did he try to

contact you, was he asking for something in return for her release? What? No?

Do you know, Henry?

SCHLEIFF: Yes. We -- on a secondhand report we do understand that his

principal demand -- we don't know what others -- were that his mother not be

extradited to the state of California, where she faces another death -- potential

death penalty as part of a murder court conviction crime.

KING: Mel, would that be to your understanding, too?

SACHS: Yes, that's my understanding. However...

KING: You haven't spoken to Kenneth?

SACHS: I haven't spoken to Kenneth. I have made yeoman efforts to reach him.

I have spoken to them up there and I told them that I would do anything to

facilitate a civil resolution of this, and fortunately, there has been. Right now, he

is appealing this case, and he has been adamant about his innocence. And he is

facing trial in California, where he is facing a death penalty sentence there.

KING: He got life here in New York, right? He got life in New York state?

SACHS: Yes, he did. In a case which was totally circumstantial, Larry, where

there wasn't any evidence which in any way indicated that this woman is, in

fact, deceased. There wasn't any blood, hair, fibers,

forensic evidence,
admissions, confessions. This is an unusual case where
he was convicted on
very little, and he looks forward to the prospect of a
successful appeal.

KING: Won't this affect that appeal though, a human
being -- judges are human
beings, they're going to know what he did today?

SACHS: It's regretful that this happened. Fortunately,
there was a safe outcome.

I don't believe that it's going to have any effect on
the appeal itself. It certainly
will have an effect upon him and his status as a
prisoner. KING: Henry, are you
going to protest security, are you going to not send
reporters into prisons again,
are you going to take any action over this?

SCHLEIFF: No. I mean, if anything, I think the
correctional facility and the
SWAT team that was involved in this is to be commended.
I mean, if anything,
it's a very rare instance. Our reporters, our anchors
are very aware of the
physical risk, you know, that's entailed by these kind
of interviews, it's
something that we live with daily. Fortunately, it's
obviously, you know, an
anomaly when you have something like this. But if
anything, we are just, you
know, delighted with the fact that it was resolved in
this way.

KING: She's OK.

As we learn more, we'll call on both of you again, Henry
Schleiff, the chairman
and CEO of Court TV; Mel Sachs, the attorney for Kenneth
Kimes. The incident
happily ended with no one injured.

When we come back, politics 2000. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

KING (on camera): Why didn't you testify?

KIMES: Why didn't I testify? Because I thought my mom
was going to have a
shot at testifying on her own.

KING: But when she didn't, why didn't you?

KIMES: Well, why didn't I? I figured at the beginning we wanted to get Court

TV to come in. I figured, if this judge isn't going to let Court TV come in, is only going to allow a one-sided print media to get only what the D.A. feeds them, I might as well be careful and stand guard knowing what kind of unfairness is going to take place.

KING: Even though the jury would have been able to see you?

KIMES: Never, it was too late.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're back. Let's meet our panel guests for the full hour -- are: Senator Fred Thompson, Republican of Tennessee -- who, by the way, campaigned with Governor Bush today in Tennessee, the home state of the vice president; Bob Woodward, the assistant managing editor of the "Washington Post." He has got a book coming in November -- he'll be back on that -- called "Meteor," about the Federal Reserve. He's a Pulitzer Prize winner.

Michael Beschloss is the presidential historian, ABC news analyst, and editor of a book just released: "The American Heritage History of the Presidents." And in New Haven, Connecticut: the distinguished former Senate majority leader, George Mitchell. Before we assemble the panel, let's go to Greensboro, North Carolina. Standing by is Karl Rove. He's the chief political strategist for the Bush campaign. The campaign -- debate takes place tomorrow.

What is the procedure tonight and tomorrow, Karl?

KARL ROVE, BUSH CAMPAIGN CHIEF POLITICAL STRATEGIST: Well, the governor had -- is having dinner right now. And he will get a good night's sleep, and then do a little bit of Q&A tomorrow morning, and I think go for a big run, and get -- take a short nap and then go to the debate.

KING: Strategically, what does he have to do tomorrow night?

ROVE: Well, he has to build on the success that we enjoyed last week, where the governor had a chance to lay out his vision and talk about his big -- the big agenda that he has for America: reforming education, Social Security and Medicare, cutting taxes, and rebuilding military defense.

And it is a chance for him, hopefully, to have a few more questions tossed his way about his most important issue, education, and -- but it's -- each one of these is a cumulative -- cumulative effect of going to each one of these and stepping up your performance from last time. Last time was his first national televised presidential debate. Al Gore had had a vice presidential debate in '92 and '96, and then the high-profile debate on your program, Mr. King, with Ross Perot.

So he has had a little bit more experience than the governor has had at this. But it was good -- good first effort.

KING: You were satisfied with it as a first effort?

ROVE: Sure, you bet. I notice the Gore campaign has been saying for the last several days that Governor Bush was babbling and couldn't string together two coherent sentences. I think that may be a reaction to the fact they have been dropping in the polls since the first debate, and Bush has been rising. But they are setting a low standard for him.

He will do very, very well on -- tomorrow night.

KING: What do you -- and it's also a debate in the format exactly like the vice presidential one, right?

ROVE: Yes, it is.

(CROSSTALK)

KING: In fact, I think it's same table.

ROVE: It is the exact same table. And if they just --
they brought it from
Danville, Kentucky here. And it will look exactly like
the studio that was set up in
Danville. KING: What do you -- a couple of other things,
Karl. What do you
make of these swinging, erratic polls?

ROVE: Well, I don't believe that the Gallup Poll that we
have -- that Governor
Bush has moved 19 points in 10 days. But I do think the
fact that all these polls
are moving in the same direction, and that the governor
leads in all of these
national polls, and having improved his position by
about 5 or 6 points, is
probably accurate.

The race is going to be very close right to the end,
though. This is going to be
the closest election since 1960. And it's going to be
decided in the last precinct in
the last hour of the last day in the last state. It's
going to be very close and very
exciting.

KING: If that is true -- and I will be asking our panel
this -- I will also ask it of
Bill Daley, who is the campaign manager for Al Gore,
when he joins us for a little
bit later -- could we have, Karl, a popular-vote winner
different from an
electoral-vote winner?

ROVE: Well, I saw that the other day that somebody
forecast that that might be
a possibility. I think it is very, very remote. I think
that we are likely to see a --
the popular-vote winner reflected in the electoral
college as well.

KING: But when you are saying it's this close, it is
also electorally close, right?

ROVE: Yes, though I think that what will end up
happening is that Governor
Bush will win with somewhere around 300 to 310 electoral
college votes, you
know, 30 to 40 more than the 270 needed to win. So there
will be a big gap in
the electoral college.

KING: But you expect we will all be up late on November

ROVE: Yes, we will. It will be an exciting night for all the political addicts in America. And it will be a fun thing to watch for them, and a grueling thing for all the politicians on either -- in either camp, I'm sure.

KING: We look forward to seeing you. I know the governor has said that he'll back on this show before they wind things up on the 7th. We look forward seeing you, Karl. Thanks.

ROVE: Great, thank you, sir.

KING: Karl Rove, the chief political strategist for the Bush campaign. The debate tomorrow night will be moderated by Jim Lehrer. We will not be with you tomorrow night. But we'll be back with you Thursday night, with Katie Couric, by the way, who might have thoughts of her own about that debate. Bill Daley will join us later.

Our panel is next. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: My opponent is of Washington, for Washington, and by Washington. He thinks all knowledge and all wisdom exists in Washington, D.C. Ours is a campaign that trusts the American people. We trust you with your money. We trust you with your children. We trust you when it comes to making health care decisions.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Our panel is represented. They have been introduced. We'll reintroduce them again in a little while. Senator Fred Thompson campaigned with Bush today in Gore's state.

Does he have a chance in your state?

SEN. FRED THOMPSON (R), TENNESSEE: Yes. Yes. He's leading there now.

KING: Why?

THOMPSON: Bush is. Well, I don't know. It's -- I would be worried if I was

Gore. This is a state that -- all the statewide officials and I are Republicans -- but the state did vote for Clinton twice. It voted for Jimmy Carter. So it certainly is a state that could go either way. And here he is right now losing by a small margin in his home state.

He hasn't had much of a presence there in a long time. The demographics have changed somewhat over the last several years. And, frankly, I think if it were not his home state, he would be behind by a large margin just based on philosophy.

KING: And, Senator Mitchell, is the reverse apparently true in Florida? Is that much closer than previously we thought it would be?

GEORGE MITCHELL, FORMER SENATE MAJORITY LEADER: It is very much closer. I think that is going to go right down to the wire. If Gore does win Florida, I think that will indicate a rather large victory for him. He can afford to lose it and still win the election.

KING: But if he wins Florida, you think that would mean a win for him. What if he loses Tennessee?

MITCHELL: Well, obviously, it would be very embarrassing. I don't think he is going to lose Tennessee. But if he does, it would be very embarrassing. But I don't think that will decide the election. I believe, Larry, as I said here several times in our earlier discussions, that Bush will hold the Republican base. Gore will hold the Democratic base.

And the election will be decided in the six or seven large Midwestern industrial states, stretching from New Jersey, through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Missouri. I think that is where it is going to be decided.

KING: Tomorrow night is the next debate, Bob. Only -- I say only -- 46 million,

half of what watched in '92, watched the first debate --
half. Do you expect
more than 46 million tomorrow night, or less?

(CROSSTALK)

BOB WOODWARD, "WASHINGTON POST": It is like the polls.
It's only a
guess. You can't tell. But I think there is still some
real serious questions to ask
both of the candidates. Certainly, coming out of the
last debate, one of the
questions lingering with Gore is this habit of
exaggeration. And I think people
want an answer to that.

And I think, in fairness to Gore, he should be asked
that directly and say, you
know: Where does this come from? Why do you have this
habit? Do you realize
that it looks like you made a mistake? And do you have
some self-awareness
about that?

So in the case of Bush, there are very good questions
that can be asked of him.

KING: Michael, the debate has a different format. It
will be informal. Yet,
though, it's still two minutes, two minutes, one -
minute response. So they're
sitting instead of standing, but the rules are the same.

MICHAEL BESCHLOSS, PRESIDENTIAL HISTORIAN: The rules are
the
same. And also just together at a table, it's a little
bit harder for it to be as icy and
hostile and chilly as it was last week. I don't think
I've seen greater hostility
between two presidential nominees in a debate in all the
last 40 years. That's
something that's a lot harder to do at a table like
this.

KING: Why do you think it had a poor viewership?
Everyone saying it was going
to go through -- it was going to be the Super Bowl of
debates.

BESCHLOSS: So you would think, because we're not in a
time of great
overwhelming crisis. If this were a time, god forbid,
where we were fighting a
war or had an economic depression, where every American

said this is an
election that will directly affect everything that has
to do with my daily life and
that of my family, people would tune in. The result of
all this is low viewership
for these debates and probably a pretty low turnout next
month.

KING: Do you agree, Senator Thompson?

THOMPSON: Yes, I agree. I think it's part of an overall
trend, unfortunately. I
think we're seeing increasing cynicism and skepticism
about all things
Washington. You can see that in trend, the declining
voter turnout...

KING: Why would that be if you have a happy country?

THOMPSON: Well, that's what makes it that much more
troublesome, and it's
especially acute among young people, who didn't live
through Watergate, didn't
live through Vietnam or any of those -- the Great
Depression -- any of those
things you would think would cause one to be cynical.
But it's -- it's there.

So people are kind of tuned out and turned off, plus
what Michael says -- I think
peace and prosperity, Washington doesn't affect me, to
heck with them, I'm not
going to pay attention to them.

KING: Bob.

WOODWARD: But I think people who watched the
Cheney-Lieberman debate
liked it. It got great reviews. There was a good feeling
about it. It was conducted
on a much higher, more serious plain. And no doubt, the
presidential candidates,
Gore and Bush, are going to take their cues from that.
And I think the acrimony
that Michael talks about will dissipate not just because
of the table, but because
that's going to be the strategy.

KING: Senator Mitchell, are you expecting a good debate
tomorrow night?

MITCHELL: I am. I think they'll both do better than they
did the last time, and I
thought they both did pretty well that time. I would

like to say on this question of
voter turnout there's one other factor that wasn't
mentioned: That's the difficulty
or ease of voting.

My home state of Maine traditionally has one of the
highest percentages of
participation in an election, because we have one of the
best laws that makes it
easy for people to register and vote. In far too many
states, there are obstacles
thrown up in the way of people. They make it very tough
for people to vote, and
so they don't get the turnout they should.

I'm not saying that's saying the exclusive or even the
dominant factor, but I
believe it is a factor. If we had laws which made it
much easier for people to get
to register and vote, I think we could improve turnout
nationally, as we have
done in Maine.

KING: Back with more of our panel. We'll be including
your phone calls. We'll
hear from the Democratic campaign manager as well. Don't
go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

DICK CHENEY (R), VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I do think
there's an
unfortunate problem here in the sense that the vice
president seems to have a
tendency to want to embellish the facts, to make up
facts to try to make a point.
And that's specially worrisome when you think about how
important credibility is
in a president.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I will
never make a
negative personal attack against the governor. He has
made a habit of aiming
them at me, but I will not reciprocate.

(END VIDEO CLIP) (COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: By the way, before we break into any other thing,
we have a bit of news

tonight. Senator Fred Thompson's red truck -- remember the red truck? He campaigned in the red truck. It's coming back, right?

THOMPSON: It ain't never gone anywhere, Larry.

KING: But you've announced tonight it's going to come back for Bush, right?

THOMPSON: We're going take a few days a week before the election, and have a little tour, have a little fun.

KING: You were on that truck, right?

WOODWARD: I was. Are you still going to drive it yourself?

THOMPSON: Oh, yes.

KING: You're going to drive it. Will the governor be on the truck?

WOODWARD: Do you still have a valid driver's license in Tennessee?

THOMPSON: Oh, yes.

KING: The governor will be on the truck?

THOMPSON: Well, we don't know about that.

(LAUGHTER)

Don't pin him down.

KING: One of the big things everyone is talking about in the first debate was the sighs. We're going to show you an example of the Gore sighs and why this was an apparent negative. Watch.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: And the vice president doesn't believe in exploration, for example, in Alaska.

(GORE SIGHING)

There's a lot of shut-in gas that we need...

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: I've had a record of appointing judges in the state of Texas. (GORE SIGHING)

That's what a governor gets to do.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: The man's practicing fuzzy math again. There's differences.

(GORE SIGHING)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: He says he's for voluntary testing. You can't have voluntary testing. You must have mandatory testing. You must say that if you receive money, you must show us whether or not children are learning to read and write, and add and subtract.

(GORE SIGHING)

That's the difference.

You may claim...

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: Why is that bad? Sighs are normal. If I'm aggravated, I sigh.

BESCHLOSS: Yes, and I think he probably felt that to do that would undercut what Bush was saying, especially because his image was going to be on the screen alongside Bush's. I think what he didn't realize would be that the rap against him would be that this showed that he was condescending and rude.

KING: Do you agree?

WOODWARD: Well...

KING: Was it rude?

WOODWARD: The kind of impatience that I want to answer every question --
it's the person in third grade who raises their hand all the time. And...

KING: You don't like...

WOODWARD: And -- and -- well, and you kind of wonder why is it necessary.

And you can understand Gore's enthusiasm for his race. He wants the job very badly. But to go back to third grade, there was that little character trait we all got graded on about self-control, and you need to get the cork in the bottle when you're on camera like that.

KING: Senator Mitchell, was it a mistake?

MITCHELL: Well, it'd be better if he hadn't done it, but I think it's a molehill that's been made into a mountain here. First off, he clearly didn't do it deliberately, because he didn't know the camera was on him during Bush's answers. Secondly, I don't think he'll do it again. It's a minor thing. But I think to give it this prominence is really to manufacturer something that doesn't exist.

Better to have a guy who sighs and knows what he's talking about.

KING: We're the media. We have to look for something. Have you sighed in the Senate?

THOMPSON: Never, Larry.

KING: Never sighed in the Senate. Sighed in film.

Why -- do you regard that as a bad thing? Do you think it has an effect on voters?

THOMPSON: Yes, I do. I think that one of the things voters ask themselves when they look at these guys is who do I want in my living room for the next four years every morning or eight years every morning, and if a guy is just irritating, I think that weighs into it.

KING: Well, what if he's irritating but smart and competent? You have a president now who the public doesn't like in certain things and loves him in other areas.

THOMPSON: Well, that's why the polls are close. The amazing thing to me about it is here's a guy who, as smart as he is, continues to do things, you know, making up stories and things of that nature, and the sighing and the debate techniques and so forth, continues to do things that he knows are things that are detrimental to himself, and yet he doesn't seem to be able to help it.

KING: You're a historian. Do we have anything to compare to this?

BESCHLOSS: Well, on the sighs, Richard Nixon had no idea that he looked the way he did on the first debate with John Kennedy, and that ended up being crucial, because what people were looking at was, is this someone, as we have been led to believe, who is so superior to Kennedy in stature that we should vote for him?

KING: So, that matters.

BESCHLOSS: It did matter.

KING: Aesthetics matter?

BESCHLOSS: They matter, and in Kennedy's case he was able to reassure people and say you may not have heard of me probably before the last couple of months, but I'm fully the equal of Vice President Nixon.

KING: We'll be right back. We'll be including your calls. Lots to talk about. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Let's reintroduce our panel. They are Senator Fred Thompson, Republican of Tennessee; Pulitzer Prize-winning Bob Woodward, the assistant managing editor of "The Washington Post" -- got a book coming called "Meteor";

Michael Beschloss, the presidential historian, "American Heritage History of the Presidents" -- he's the editor of that book just released; and in New Haven, Connecticut, former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell. And it's great to have them with us. In a little while, we'll be checking in with Bill Daley.

OK, we've taken on Mr. Gore pretty good. Now on the other side, there are some, Bob Woodward, attacking Mr. Cheney over remarks he's made about gay marriage. He said people should be free to enter into any kind of relationship they want to enter into. And he said the issue of gay marriages should be decided by the states. Do you think some right-wingers of the right will stay home because of that?

WOODWARD: Well, that's what they say, but what he expressed was total tolerance. And...

KING: Intolerant people sometimes don't like tolerance.

WOODWARD: Well, that's right, but he expressed a view that I think probably lots of people hold.

Interestingly enough, it is not necessarily consistent with the view he had when he was secretary of defense and was very much opposed to gays in the military.

KING: But he has, of course, the problem with his daughter, right? I mean, not a problem -- what does do?

BESCHLOSS: Yes, and also, he didn't demagogue it by dragging his daughter in and making this a personal story, which I think people respected.

But the other thing is that these debates are terrific for reassurance. That's what they mainly do. They don't really sell you on a candidate, but they reassure you.

In Cheney's case, he was trying to reassure people that he wasn't that extreme right-wing figure that they were hearing about last summer.

KING: But what did -- does it hurt him with the extreme

right-wing? Are they
going to go to Buchanan over that?

BESCHLOSS: I don't think there's much sign of that.
Buchanan is at about 1
percent. You know, the Republicans have been locked out
of the White House
for eight years. There's nothing that unifies a party
like defeat. I think these
conservatives are very happy to stick with Bush and
Cheney. KING: Senator
Thompson, this is this close. Could a debate swing it?
Who is undecided?

Everyone on this -- is everyone on this panel decided?
Woodward probably is
undecided.

WOODWARD: No, I decide when I go to the polls the
morning of election day,
and that...

KING: Really?

WOODWARD: All the information is in, and then you can
make a judgment.

KING: So you can classify yourself as a true undecided?

WOODWARD: Yes.

BESCHLOSS: I do the same thing.

KING: You do you the same thing?

BESCHLOSS: I'm a registered independent. I'm completely
apartisan. But the
idea is that the campaign shows you all sorts of things
about these characters,
and you might learn something the last couple of weeks.

KING: Do I hear a laugh or a sigh from Senator Mitchell?

MITCHELL: You didn't hear it from me. You heard it from
the cameraman.

KING: What do you make...

MITCHELL: He's laughing and sighing.

KING: We have the answer to the undecided, Senator
Mitchell, that they're right
here.

MITCHELL: Well, Fred and I aren't undecided, I'll tell you that.

KING: No. Well, how do you...

THOMPSON: I'm here in the studio with these guys. I'm going to work on it.

KING: All right, how do you, George, get the Woodward-Beschloss vote? What do you have to do or what does your candidate have to do in the next four weeks?

MITCHELL: Well, these two particular people, I think, he has to continue to demonstrate the command of the issues that he has. I think he should emphasize even more so the tremendous prosperity of the past eight years and make clear that's not assured and the best way to guarantee its continuance is through his election. And based on this discussion, I think has to stay away from the mannerisms that I happen to think are rather minor, but which seem to play large in some people's minds.

KING: And what, Senator Thompson, does George W. Bush have to do to get Woodward and Beschloss?

THOMPSON: Well, I think he has to keep doing basically what he is doing. The trend....

KING: They haven't been decided based on what both of them have done.

THOMPSON: Well, the trends -- the trends are going his way right now, it seems like, across the country. It seems that way in Tennessee, certainly, and across the country. So I would just advise him to do -- I'm not sure there's any magic bullet, and I think you could probably make a mistake searching for one.

KING: Find one...

THOMPSON: You've heard the litany of issues that have been discussed. Karl Rove laid them out very well a while ago. I would add one thing, I think it would

be good. If he could emphasize a little bit more the necessity that -- the point that whether it's a health care plan or a tax plan, neither one of these guy's plans are going to be enacted as such.

KING: You think he should say that?

THOMPSON: Well, no, not necessarily, but that's the fact. So what that means is that we really need someone who can bring together both sides at the table. Someone...

KING: A compromise plan.

THOMPSON: ... who can work across the aisle, and he's done that in Texas. That's what we're going to need over these next four years more than anything else

KING: Does that impress you, if a man can bring people together?

WOODWARD: I mean, we really are not -- shouldn't be made a focus group of two, because...

BESCHLOSS: Thank you, Bob,

KING: You both admitted you haven't decided.

WOODWARD: Yes, but, I mean, it's our job not to decide, and to look at everything and examine it. I'm interested -- I mean, I think one of the looming questions in all of this, and Fred got right to the point when he said a lot of this stuff is not going to be enacted or it's not going to be enacted in the way it is...

KING: It's the first time we've heard it mentioned.
WOODWARD: ... proposed.
And that is exactly, exactly the case. I mean, that you can be sure of.
Remember, Mrs. Clinton's health care plan.

KING: Would both candidates be better off saying that tomorrow night?

BESCHLOSS: It might well...

KING: Listen, this is my plan, this is his plan, but

it's going to be a different plan,
and it might be in the middle.

BESCHLOSS: And people realize that whoever is going to
be elected the next
president is not going to be a very powerful person,
especially compared to the
presidents of the 20th century. He's probably going to
come in with a narrow
margin, probably with a divided Congress at a time when
Americans don't want
to send a lot of power to Washington, and which the
Congress doesn't want to
give the president too much dominance. So, that would be
sort of a reality
check.

KING: So, Senator Mitchell, honesty would be refreshing?

MITCHELL: Well, I don't take that as guaranteed. Look,
things happen in a way
that you can't predict. I think that people should elect
the best person largely
because they don't know for sure what the issues would
be and better to have a
competent person who you know can deal with issues,
especially those that they
haven't been able to discuss in the campaign because
they haven't arisen. That's,
frankly, why I think Gore will in the end win in a
narrow race.

But I want to get back to the issues. Again, I think
there's a lot of talk in the first
debate about prescription drugs, about Medicare reform,
about all these other
things. None of that is going happen if the economy
turns down. And the notion
that for the next 10 years the economy is going to be
just as it was the past
eight, no matter what happens, is, of course, a fantasy.

KING: Does anyone have...

MITCHELL: It is going to depend upon events yet to occur
and that's the key
issue in the campaign.

WOODWARD: Now he said something very important there. He
labeled the idea
that we're going to have 10 years of surplus and good
economic times a fantasy,
and that -- I mean, if you examine any businessperson,
any economist, they

would agree with Senator Mitchell, that hard times are going to come. And really, the question to ask the candidates also is, suppose that happens, suppose the economy turns down, suppose we have a recession, what is your plan and what is your flexibility?

KING: Does anyone on panel think we can have a popular vote winner different from the electoral vote winner?

MITCHELL: I think it's unlikely, but it is more possible in this election than in any in recent years the way the thing is shaping up. It is conceivable that the popular vote could be extremely close, tipped one way and the electoral vote the other way. And that depends again on those seven or eight large Midwestern industrial states.

KING: Michael, you're nodding your head.

BESCHLOSS: It could happen, and it also sort of falls out in other odd ways. 1960, Nixon lost by 100,000 votes, but at the same time he won 26 states. You have have situations like this.

In 1968, there was the possibility that the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives because of George Wallace, who finally wound up with 13 percent of the vote. Nixon kept on saying, Hubert, agree with me that we'll just have -- instruct the House to go along with the popular vote winner because the Democrats controlled the House. Humphrey said, I believe in the Constitution.

KING: We'll take a break and be back with more. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

REP. RICK LAZIO (R-NY), NEW YORK SENATE CANDIDATE: The very first day I got into the race, you know, they had little private people with cameras -- you know, the sort of campaign operatives with cameras

trying to harass. And
they do that with my wife right now. And we have tried
to ignore that and stay
focused on...

KING: What do you mean? Harassing your wife, how?

LAZIO: Oh, they just, you know, they try to -- to tape,
to have people and tape
us, everything we do, and try and film everything that
we do.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: Is that race the most interesting, other than the
presidential, Michael?

BESCHLOSS: Why do you exclude the presidential, Larry,
as some people may
feel it's the most interesting in general? It has all
the elements. I would love to
write about it 30 years from now as history.

KING: Bob.

WOODWARD: People are fascinated...

KING: Got nothing to compare it to.

WOODWARD: I mean, here -- here we have one of the
candidates saying that
his wife is being harassed on the campaign trail in a
way that doesn't quite make
sense. And we -- we still have not fully answered the
question in that race
exactly why Hillary Clinton decided to run. KING: This
an "if," Fred. If she is he
elected to the Senate, are things going to be a little
weird there with Secret
Service -- in the Senate?

THOMPSON: It depends on whether she goes on my committee
or not.

KING: Would you like her on your committee?

(LAUGHTER)

THOMPSON: I would rather not talk about that, if you
don't mind.

KING: OK.

Senator Mitchell, how does that race look to you in New

York?

MITCHELL: Well, I think she is going to win. But I think that Fred will verify this, that she is going to be in for a rude awakening when she actually gets into the Senate. It's really a tough place to get anything done. I was the majority leader for six years. I had a very hard time getting anything done. And when you are No. 100 on the totem pole, it's really tough.

She'll get a lot of attention. But to actually get anything done in the Senate is really pretty tough.

KING: Wait a minute.

MITCHELL: I think she is going to get elected, though.

KING: Senator Thompson, as a former first lady, she will not have clout beyond of that a normal freshman?

THOMPSON: Well, I think she will have a bit of more bully pulpit. But in terms of getting things done, I mean George is absolutely right. It's -- it's very difficult. You have to lay a lot of groundwork. You have to work hard over a long period of time to get much of anything accomplished -- for anybody. And it will be no different.

KING: Michael.

BESCHLOSS: And it may be like Robert Kennedy, the previous one who came from another state and ran in New York; 1965, he was the most freshman of senators, but he was an instant presidential candidate -- and much more clout outside the Senate than within.

KING: And, by the way, I have been -- I've been saying the wrong name of Bob Woodward's forthcoming book. I've been saying "Meteor." It is "Maestro." And it's about Alan Greenspan and the Federal Reserve. "Meteor" ain't a bad title don't laugh.

George, don't laugh at me.

(CROSSTALK)

KING: ... be called "Maestro."

WOODWARD: I heard -- and we -- I was evaluating it in my head when you gave the wrong title. But it's "Maestro."

MITCHELL: Larry, if -- if I could just say that Bob Woodward behaved like the ideal presidential debater. He didn't correct you when you made a mistake.

(LAUGHTER)

BESCHLOSS: I heard him sighing.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: All right, let's get a phone call in.

Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, hello.

CALLER: Hello, Larry.

KING: Hi.

CALLER: Would the panel comment on media spin and its effect on these roller-coaster presidential polls?

KING: Yes.

Bob? They're spinning every second.

(CROSSTALK)

WOODWARD: Well, they are. And you -- I think the best thing a voter can do is ignore the polls. I was talking to a plain ordinary voter today, and he said something that really hit me. He said being a voter is hard, because if you have listened to all this stuff and you try to sort it out, you hear all these numbers, all these proposals. And the candidate that wins may be the candidate who adopts a kind of voters' relief act, making it simple, telling it straight, being very direct, and not confusing people.

KING: In other words: "In last week of this campaign, I shall not say the word trillion."

BESCHLOSS: Yes, sounds like that will get a lot of votes.

KING: As we go to break, and come back with some more phone calls, we expect to connect with Bill Daley down in Long Boat Key in a moment or so -- hopefully -- here was Hillary Clinton today on the "Rosie O'Donnell Show."

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, "ROSIE O'DONNELL SHOW")

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Now you are going to get your hands all slimy.

ROSIE O'DONNELL, HOST: Perfect. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: All right, we are going to take out the seeds and strings. So take your scraper scoop.

O'DONNELL: Your scooper.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or you can use an ice cream scoop. But, you know -- anyway. I sometimes stick my hands in, pull these.

O'DONNELL: Use your hands.

(CROSSTALK)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, no, the important thing is, before you're done, though, Rosie...

O'DONNELL: Yes, that's good. That's nice.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, there you go.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Before we wind up things with our panel -- Karl Rove was with us earlier -- now we'll go down to Long Boat Key, Florida, where Bill Daley is standing by. He is the campaign chairman for the Al Gore campaign.

What does Vice President Gore have to do, Bill, tomorrow night?

BILL DALEY, GORE CAMPAIGN CHAIRMAN: I think he has to, once again,

Larry, reiterate his positions, the things he feels strongly about, that he will do as president. Talk about his programs on keeping our economy strong, strengthening Social Security, making sure that retirement security is there for the American people. And so, I think he will do that, and he will do it once again in a clear and a forceful way.

KING: Were you were disappointed in debate one? What was your reaction?

DALEY: No, I think it was clear. All of the polls immediately after were that Al Gore won. Obviously, there are a lot of observations about things that, quite frankly, in our opinion, were not relevant to whether or not either one of these people clearly laid out their positions. Al Gore did. He reiterated it time and time again. But it's unfortunate that some people jump on mannerisms or other things and try to say that that should judge whether someone should be president or not.

But Al Gore was very clear about his desire and his specific plans to keep our economy strong, which as George Mitchell said, if we don't keep our economy strong, then all these other things we want to do as investments in the future can't be done.

KING: But isn't -- isn't credibility -- let's say there is exaggeration, isn't that a fair critique, Bill?

DALEY: Well, there's -- obviously, both of these candidates are critiqued day in and day out by you and your colleagues in the media on a whole host of things.

The most important thing, though, is the validity of their ideas and the specificity in which they lay out their programs, Larry, not the minor things. It is the major things.

Al Gore, I think, clearly has stated that he may have made a minor mistake on whether or not he traveled with someone to Texas or not. But on the issues that are important to the American people, like the tax plan,

he was very specific and
very knowledgeable about his own plan and the
shortcomings in Governor
Bush's plans.

KING: What do you make of these poll swings?

DALEY: Well, I believe that this race has been close for
weeks. There is no way
that Al Gore was up 11 points five days ago, and then
went down eight points.
Today, it is a three-point spread in your poll. There is
another national poll out
showing Al Gore winning. The bottom line is, this has
been a close race. It's
going to stay a close race. I agree with Karl Rove when
he said the American
people are going to look at these three debates and then
collectively make a
decision. But it will go down to the wire, and I think
it'll be a very exciting month
that we've got ahead of us.

KING: Are you surprised, Bill, that Senator Thompson
tells us that Bush is
slightly ahead in Tennessee?

DALEY: Well, we've seen polls that show just the
opposite. But there's no close
-- no -- no question that it's close in much of the
country. But Al Gore will win
his home state of Tennessee, with all due respect to the
senator.

KING: Will we be up late on the 7th?

DALEY: I would assume we'll be up late. You know, the
West Coast, California,
Washington, Oregon, and other states will be important
parts to this race. So I
think we will. Obviously, there will be some people who
try to go to bed off of
the exit polls, but that's a mistake, I think, in the
modern day.

KING: And do you think the network should not project?

DALEY: Oh, I think they should not project. I think it's
unfair to the people on
the West Coast. I think it is the wrong thing to do, and
I think that's something
that they should all agree to do now.

But it's going to be an exciting month, because Al Gore

is going to be out there
laying out the case for his candidacy and the sort of
exciting things he and Joe
Lieberman want to do when they're the next president and
vice president of the
United States.

KING: Thanks, Bill, great seeing you as always.

DALEY: Good, Larry. Take care of yourself. KING: Bill
Daley in Long Boat Key.
He's the campaign chairman for Al Gore. We'll be back
and wrap it up with our
panel, and ask what they about Hillary and Rosie
O'Donnell and what that had to
do with the campaign. Don't go away.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GORE: We basically have a choice to make. We can have a
very large tax cut
that is geared mostly to the wealthiest in our society,
or we can have
middle-class tax cuts that are targeted and affordable,
and we can invest in
education and the top priority items for our future. But
we can't do both. You
can't make education a top priority if a tax cut for he
the wealthiest is the first,
second, third and fourth priority.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're going to get one more call and then some
sum-up comments. But,
Bob, what did you make of -- what does stuffing a
pumpkin have to do with
being a senator?

WOODWARD: Where you showed Mrs. Clinton doing this on
"The Rosie
O'Donnell Show." It shows that it's hard to be a
candidate also.

KING: You've got to do these things.

WOODWARD: You have to do it, and it's something Senator
Thompson would
never do.

WOODWARD: I perfected the pumpkin stuffing...

(LAUGHTER)

... many years before I ran for the Senate. I think it's just another case of one of her media buddies trying to help her out.

KING: Senator Mitchell...

(CROSSTALK)

THOMPSON: ... won't be enough.

KING: ... do you have staff a pumpkin to get attention?

No.

MITCHELL: Now, Larry, you're letting your gender bias show. Candidates, male, in New Hampshire participate in ax throwing contests, you don't ask questions about that. One of the things -- one of the things that everybody runs for office in America knows is that you must learn the art of making a fool of yourself gracefully, and you might as well submit to it. That was mild compared to what Fred and I and others have been through. There's no criticism for that.

KING: Abe Lincoln made porridge, Michael. BESCHLOSS: He didn't do it on

"Rosie O'Donnell" thankfully. But you know, Stevenson in '56 was not

connecting, and he said to his aide, "What am I doing wrong?" The aide said:

"When a little girl hands you a stuffed baby alligator, you say, 'This is just what I wanted.' You don't say what you did say, which was, 'For christ's sake, what's this?'"

(LAUGHTER)

THOMPSON: Someone said before we elect a president, we first all make them prove they're not worthy of it.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: Wellsville, New York, hello.

CALLER: Hi, Larry.

KING: Hi.

CALLER: Does the panel think that the reported NRA support for Bush could negatively affect Gore?

KING: Gun control has not come up yet the debates, either debate.

WOODWARD: It hasn't, and it's important issue.

KING: I'm sure Jim Lehrer will bring it up tomorrow.

WOODWARD: Quite possibly. I mean, you know, it is a solid bloc that really cling -- they cling to their guns, and they will vote that way.

KING: Can it hurt your side, Senator Thompson?

THOMPSON: No, I don't think so. I think this is an election where turnout is going to be key, if you'll pardon the pun.

KING: And that'll win it.

THOMPSON: So any group that's activated, motivated strongly is going to be important.

KING: The NRA going to bring people out, Michael?

BESCHLOSS: Could very well, and in some surprising states, too.

KING: Yes, but America -- most American women are not crazy about he the gun control...

BESCHLOSS: And that's exactly -- and that's exactly why the strategy is that for Governor Bush, for instance, to downplay it in the debates, but let these people organize and turn out the vote.

KING: All right. We've got about a minute and a half. Senator Mitchell, what do you expect to see tomorrow night?

MITCHELL: I expect to see a good debate. I think both will be better than they were for the first time, because they've now had the benefit of seeing what they did and listening to criticism by people like us. I think they'll repeat the basic themes, because I think both want to make their case.

One of the points you talked about earlier, Larry, was getting to the undecided. I think the debates are at least as much about reinforcing and invigorating your own base. So I think they'll keep at that, as well.

KING: Senator Thompson, what do you expect tomorrow?

THOMPSON: Yes, I agree with that. I'm kind of in a minority on the format. I'm not sure this works to Bush's advantage. Gore is very strong and sometimes overpowerful, overpowering, and some people give him credit for that, and I think that's the reason why some people thought he won the debate. He dominated the debate in terms of time and all that.

I think in a more informal setting that lends itself to someone who wants to do that if the moderator doesn't control it.

(CROSSTALK)

It may turn -- it may turn some people off, but it might allow him to dominate it in some way.

WOODWARD: Well, it's going to be a debate obviously about issues, but the real issue probably in this debate is trust. Do people come away with a feeling, I trust that person to be president?

KING: Michael?

BESCHLOSS: Yes, and in context of most debates, reassure people who are leaning. And in Gore's case, reassure people who are leaning toward him but a little bit worried that perhaps this is not someone I'm entirely comfortable with. In Bush's case, reassure people who would like to vote for Bush, but are a little bit worried about perhaps lack of experience.

KING: Thank you all. CNN's complete coverage starts at 8:00 Eastern tomorrow night. We'll be off tomorrow night, and following the debate, Wolf Blitzer will have another town meeting with undecideds. We'll be back Thursday night with Katie Couric.

Thanks for joining us, stay tuned for NEWSSTAND, and
good night.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Deanne E. Benos (CN=Deanne E. Benos/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-DEC-2000 10:47:16.00

SUBJECT: Rolling Stone interview on AFI

TO: dbern@hci-cphv.org (dbern@hci-cphv.org @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here -- You can call her and talk about this scoopy interview! Please do not pass ths on to anyone else, though. Seriously. Deanne

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release For
December 7, 2000

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT
BY ROLLING STONE MAGAZINE

November 2, 2000

Aboard Air Force One
En route Los Angeles, California

2:45 P.M. EST

Q Thank you for your time, I appreciate it. It takes time to do something like this.

THE PRESIDENT: Good.

Q Why do you think the race is so tight, given the economy, the issues, the incumbency. How could it get to be this close?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think for one thing, things have been good for a long time and I think a lot of people may take it for granted and may not have -- they may not be as clear as they should be, which I hope we can use the last week to do, on what specific policies contributed to it and what could undermine it. I think that's one issue.

I also think that, you know, there's not as much general awareness as there might be about the differences between the two parties on health

care, education, the environment and crime, where I believe that the things we've done over the last eight years had a measurable impact on all those things going in the right direction.

And a lot of -- most presidential races are fairly close, you know, because a lot of presidential voting is cultural.

Q The way you were raised.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the way you were raised, and sort of the neighborhood you live in, your socio-economic and ethnic background. I mean, a lot of it's cultural. So I think there are a lot of reasons it's close.

Also, keep in mind, in the history of our republic, only two Vice Presidents have ever been directly elected President. One of them, when Martin Van Buren succeeded Andrew Jackson, we were effectively a one-party country then. And the other, when George Bush defeated Michael Dukakis, the country was not in as good a shape as it is now, but it was in pretty good shape. And Bush basically destroyed Dukakis. It was a hugely negative campaign with a lot of charges that were never effectively rebutted.

So this has been a much more positive race. There have been differences on the issues, but neither one of them has called each other's patriotism into question or whether they're normal Americans. Basically, the wrap that was put on Dukakis was like reverse plastic surgery. So I think that that explains it largely.

Q At the end of the interview I'm going to ask you to make a bet with me.

What physical change in you says that you've served eight years and it's a job that really takes a toll?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think I'm in better shape, better health than I was eight years ago, in a lot of ways. My hair is gray, I think that's about it. I've got a few wrinkles I didn't have eight years ago.

But I've held up pretty well. I've had a good time. I've enjoyed it. I couldn't help my hair going gray, it would probably have gone gray if I hadn't become President.

Q One of the most important jobs that you, as a President, have is to talk to the country in the wake of national tragedies, frame the issues for the American people. I'm going to ask you about two of the things that happened during your two terms: the Oklahoma City bombing and the Columbine shootings.

Where were you when you first heard about the Oklahoma City bombing and what was your first reaction, personally? And then how did you think you should frame that to the American people, to help them understand what's really a national trauma? And where were you when you heard it?

THE PRESIDENT: I was in the White House. I believe I was in the White House, because I remember making a statement at the beginning, right in the Rose Garden, saying what you would expect me to say, expressing the nation's sympathy for the loss, but also urging the American people not to jump to conclusions about who had done it.

Remember in the beginning, there were a lot of people saying it was obviously some sort of act of foreign terrorism. There was one man that was brought back on an airplane, he was flying out of the country through to London and he was brought back, suspected of maybe being involved, and he wasn't. And, of course, subsequently, it was a domestic terrorist act.

But then when I went to Oklahoma, at the memorial service, what I tried to do was to elevate what the people who had been working in that building were doing, they were all public servants. And it was at a time when it was quite fashionable to bash the government. And I told myself, even, that I would never refer to people who worked for the government -- even in agencies I thought weren't performing well -- as bureaucrats again, because this whole -- we have gotten for more than a dozen years a sort of demeaning rhetoric about the nature of government and the nature of public service. And I tried to point out that these people were our friends and our neighbors and our relatives, and they were an important part of America's family and that their service ought to be honored in that way.

And also, obviously, I took a strong stand against terrorism. And I was able -- later I went to Michigan State and gave a commencement speech and tried to amplify on that. But I really believe that was the turning of the tide in the venom of anti-government feeling.

Q Did you see -- was it a conscience thought to you that this could be the turning of the tide, and if you focused it correctly, if you said, you know, you can't love your country if you hate your government, that this would crystallize that feeling?

THE PRESIDENT: I think I felt that after I had some time to think about it. In the beginning I was just horrified about all those people dying, all those little kids killed and hurt.

Q What I'm trying to get at is, once beyond that obvious first reaction --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I mean, it occurred to me that -- you know, the American people are fundamentally decent and they've got a lot of sense. And I thought that this might break a fever that had been gripping us for too long. And I think it did.

Q And you thought, if I can take advantage of this opportunity -- I mean, to have this tragedy -- in every tragedy comes an opportunity, so is this an opportunity where I can make people re-think that idea.

THE PRESIDENT: I think in a way, at least at some -- maybe not even at a conscious level the American people were re-thinking it. And I think maybe that's why what I said at the memorial service struck a responsive chord in the country.

Q What I'm trying to get at is, was that a deliberate thought on your part? That I have an opportunity as President to --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I thought that -- yes, I was conscious of what I was saying.

Q Did you connect it in some way to a kind of metaphorical bomb-throwing of Newt Gingrich, of the real anti-government stance that he was taking at the time?

THE PRESIDENT: I was careful not to do that. I wanted it to change the American peoples' attitude toward public servants and their government. But to do it you had to focus on what happened.

One of the things that I didn't like about Newt -- and he certainly wasn't responsible in any way for the Oklahoma City bombing, because one of the things I didn't like about him is he was always blaming the 1960s or liberals for everything that went wrong. When that woman, Susan Smith, drove her kids into the lake in South Carolina, he blamed the 1960s, and it turned out that the poor woman had been sexually abused by her father, her stepfather, who was on the local board of the Christian Coalition or something.

And when that woman dropped her kid out of the window in Chicago, he blamed the welfare culture. He was always blaming. So I didn't want to get into where I was doing reverse blame. I just wanted to try to make it clear to the American people that we shouldn't have a presumption against government in general or public servants in particular.

Q What about Columbine? Where did you first hear the news about that? And, again, what was your reaction to that?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe I was in the White House when I heard that, but I'm not sure. But I know that I called the local officials and the school officials from the Oval Office. You know, that was only the most recent and the most grotesque of a whole series of highly visible school shootings that we've had -- a number of them in the south, one of them in Jonesboro, Arkansas, that was in my home state, and I knew some of the people who were involved, who run the school and in the county and in the city.

There was one in Pearl, Mississippi, and there was --

Q One in Oregon.

THE PRESIDENT: The one in Springfield, Oregon. What I thought there was that -- I thought a lot of things. I thought, number one, how did those kids get all those guns and how could they have had that kind of

arsenal without their parents knowing? And I thought, after I read a little about it, how did they get so lost without anybody finding them before they went over the edge?

We had a spate of -- before all these killings associated with that kind of darkness on the net, network --

Q What do you mean, darkness on the net?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, those kids were apparently into some sort of a -- weren't they into some sort of satanic-like thing?

Q No, they had their websites and --

THE PRESIDENT: Their websites, yes. There were, earlier, a number of kids who killed themselves who were into talking to each other about destruction, but they weren't killing other people. And I just kept -- I worry that -- I worried then, I worry now about the people in our society, particularly children, that just drift off and no one knows, or people feel helpless to do anything about it.

You know, I couldn't help thinking, wondering whether those kids could have been saved if somebody got to them, and then whether all those other children would still be alive.

Q It seemed shocking to me and a lot of other people that after that there was no -- we didn't get any new gun control legislation after an event like that.

THE PRESIDENT: It's going to be interesting to see what the voters in Colorado to. They have a provision on the ballot now in Colorado to close the gun show loophole. And it's a heavily Republican state and I think it's going to pass.

Q Right.

THE PRESIDENT: I think what happened is that -- well, first of all, you can't say nothing came out of it, because there was an organization of young people in Colorado that then organized kids all over the country for common sense gun legislation. They got about 10,000 kids involved. Now we have the Million Mom March, and they're very active.

But the truth is that when legislation time comes that a lot of the people in Congress are still frightened of the NRA, because even though there is broad public support for these measures, they are still not primary voting issues for a lot of the people who are for them. Whereas, the NRA can muster an enormous percentage of the vote -- maybe 15 percent, maybe even 20 sometimes for who -- that's a primary voting issue.

So if you've got an issue where you're ahead 60-30, but in your 60 it's a primary voting issue for 10 percent of the people, and in their 30 it's a primary voting issue for 20 percent of the people, the truth is, you're a net loser by 10 percent. That's the way -- that's what happens in Congress and state legislatures. They're genuinely afraid.

Q They know they could lose their seats.

THE PRESIDENT: You see the tirade that Charlton Heston has carried on against Al Gore and me, before -- saying that I was glad some of these people were killed because it gave me an excuse to take people's guns away. We never proposed anything that would take anybody's guns away.

I saw a special -- you may have seen it on television the other night on ABC. Peter Jennings actually went out and went to some of these gun shows. And he was talking to all these people who were absolutely convinced that we wanted to take their guns away. The NRA is great at raising money and building their organizational power by terrifying people with inflammatory rhetoric. I guess that's why, since LBJ passed the first law after Bobby Kennedy was killed, I was the first President to take him on --

Q You got Brady and assault through. But why didn't you take the opportunity with this post-Columbine atmosphere? I mean, you called the White House Conference on Violence immediately --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I did, I tried --

Q But it focused on, like, violence in the media --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but we also did lots and lots and lots of events --

Q -- and then you thought you could reason with the NRA.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I didn't think I could reason with the NRA. I thought Congress would be so shocked and the public was so galvanized that we had a window of opportunity.

Q Right. And what happened to that, is my question.

THE PRESIDENT: The Republican leadership just delayed until the fever went down. That's what happened. They knew that they couldn't afford to have their members voting wrong on closing the gun show loophole or banning the importation of large capacity ammunition clips, which allows people to get around the assault weapons ban.

Q Were you powerless to do something about that?

THE PRESIDENT: No, we had tons of events. And we got a vote -- if you'll remember, we finally got a vote in the Senate, where you can bring things up, where we got a majority vote for it. Al Gore broke the tie -- another reason he ought to be President, he broke the tie.

But we couldn't get a bill out of a conference committee that had it in there. If we could ever have gotten a clean vote --

Q You would have won that vote.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, absolutely.

Q And beat that --

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. We could win the vote today if you could get a vote. But the leadership of the Republican Party, as long as they're in the majority in both Houses, they can control things -- especially in the House, you can write the rules so that you can just keep stuff from coming up.

Q So despite your power, despite that event --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And we had lots and lots and lots of events at the White House, not just one. We had a ton of events, we brought people in, we talked about it, we pushed and pushed. We finally got the vote in the Senate. We got 50 votes, then Al broke the tie, we got 51. And there's no question that we could pass it.

But I'll remind you that one of reasons that Democrats are in the minority today in the House is because of the Brady law and the assault weapons ban. And, interestingly enough, we didn't -- there is not a single hunter has missed an hour, not a single sports shooter has missed an event -- an hour hunting, I should have finished the sentence -- or a single sports shooter has missed an event. But they acted like the end of the world, but a half million felons, fugitives and stalkers haven't gotten handguns because of the Brady law.

The ironic thing is, there's no reason here -- when we tried to pass the Brady law they said, well, this won't do any good because all these criminals get their guns either one-on-one or at gun shows or urban flea markets.

Q Let me change the subject. This is absolutely amazing --

THE PRESIDENT: I feel passionately about this, and I'm glad I took them on. I'm just sorry I couldn't win more. There are a lot of good people out there in America who work hard, their only recreation is hunting and fishing; they don't follow politics all that closely; they get these NRA mailings -- they're good people, but they think they can believe these folks. And they know that if they can stir them up, they can raise more money and increase their membership. And they do it by basically terrifying Congress.

Q How would you characterize race relations today, as compared to when you took office?

THE PRESIDENT: I think they're considerably better.

Q In what ways?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think, first of all, the country is

changing, it's growing ever more diverse and, therefore, more and more people are having more contacts across racial, ethnic and religious lines. And I think that, ultimately, the more people relate to each other, the more they come to not just tolerate -- I don't like the word "tolerance" in this context because it implies that one group is superior, putting up with an inferior group and tolerating them.

I think the more they come to genuinely appreciate each other's heritage, find it interesting and find a fundamental common humanity. I think a lot of it is just systematic human contact. And beyond the human contact, I think that the race initiative we started led to hundreds of efforts all over the country to have honest conversations. You know, sometimes people work around each other for years and they don't know the first thing about one another. Forget about race, I mean, there are people who probably work in the White House who see each other every day that don't know the first thing about one another.

So I think that the one thing we did was to spark all these conversations and also to highlight systematic efforts that were working in local communities and try to get them replicated around the country -- in communities, in work places, in schools. I think that there was a genuine effort to deal with that.

I think the third thing is that we may have had some impact on it, I and my administration, because we were so much more diverse than any other administration in history. And I think people felt -- who had never felt that way before -- that the White House was their house, too, the government was their government, too. So I think the climate in the country was positive for that.

Q And you sense that change in climate from those factors in --

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. Look at the difference --

Q Because this is one of your main priorities.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And look at the difference in the rhetoric in the presidential campaign this year. All the rhetoric is about racial inclusion. Now, you know, we could argue about the policies. I think that the Republican policies are still divisive, but the rhetoric is about inclusion. And even they -- a number of their members have taken a different tack on immigration.

Q Do you have any special message to young people, any sort of valedictorian thoughts to the kids in school right now, as you leave office?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I do. First of all, I think that they should realize that they're very fortunate to be living in this country at this time. Fortunate because of our economic prosperity, fortunate because of our enormous diversity and fortunate because of the permeation of technology in our society, all of which enables us to relate to the rest of the world and to one another in different and better ways.

Secondly, I think they should understand that our future success is not guaranteed and depends upon their interest in public affairs, as well as their private lives, and their participation. One of the things that's really concerned me about this election is all these articles that say that young people think there is not much in it for them. I think maybe that's because there has been a lot of debate about Social Security and Medicare in the debate. They think that's an old folks' issue.

But it's actually not just an old folks' issue, because when all of us baby boomers retire -- and I'm the oldest of the baby boomers, the baby boomers are people that are between the ages now of 54 and 36. So when we retire -- unless everybody starts having babies at a much more rapid rate, or we have hugely greater immigration -- there will only be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. Now, more of us are going to have to work into our later years. And more of us have a choice now because -- one of the good things that Congress did unanimously was to lift the earnings limit on Social Security.

But, anyway, even the Social Security issue is a youth issue. Why? Because the baby boomers, most of them I know are obsessed with our retirement not imposing an undue burden on our children and our grandchildren. But there are all these other issues. We have to build a clean energy future to avoid global warming.

Two stunning studies have come out in the last month and because of the presidential campaign they've not been much noticed. One analysis of a polar icecap says that the 1990s were the warmest decade in a thousand years. The other projecting study estimates that if we don't change our greenhouse gas emissions the climate could warm between 2.4 and 10 degrees over the next century -- 2.4 is too much. Ten degrees would literally flood a lot of Louisiana and Florida. This is a very serious thing.

Then you've got this incredible scientific and technological revolution that will lead to, among other things, if you just take the human genome alone, a lot of the young people in America today, when they have their children they'll get a little gene card to take home with them from the hospital; and their children will be born with a life expectancy of 90 years, because they'll be able to avoid so many of the illnesses and problems that they have a biological propensity to.

So this is a fascinating time to be alive. But it's not free of challenges. So I would say to the young people you ought to be grateful you're alive at this time, you'll probably live in the most prosperous, interesting time in human history; but there are a lot of big challenges out there and you have to be public citizens as well as private people.

Q Do you think that people should go to jail for possessing or using or even selling small amounts of marijuana?

THE PRESIDENT: I think, first of all --

Q This is after -- we're not publishing until after the

election.

THE PRESIDENT: I think that most small amounts of marijuana have been de-criminalized in most places and should be. I think that what we really need -- one of the things that I ran out of time before I could do is a re-examination of our entire policy on imprisonment.

Some people deliberately hurt other people. And if they get out of prison -- if they get in prison and they get out, they'll hurt them again. And they ought to be in jail because they can't be trusted to be on the streets. Some people do things that are so serious they have to be put in jail to discourage other people from doing similar things.

But a lot of people are in prison today because they, themselves, have drug problems or alcohol problems. And too many of them are getting out -- particularly out of the state systems -- without treatment, without education, without skills, without serious effort at job placement.

Q You're talking about any offender?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. But there are tons of people in prison who are non-violent offenders, who have drug-related charges that are directly related to their own drug problems.

Q Don't you think those people -- should we be putting non-violent drug offenders in jail at all, or should we put them in treatment programs that are more fitting and not --

THE PRESIDENT: I think it depends on what they did. You know, I have some experience with this. Let me just say --

Q Well, I remember your experience is based on your brother's --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me just say about my brother -- whom I love and am immensely proud of, because he kicked a big cocaine habit. I mean, his habit got up to four grams a day; he had a serious, serious habit. He was lucky to live through that. But if he hadn't had the constitution of an ox, he might not have.

I think if he hadn't gone to prison, actually been put away forcibly somewhere, I think his problem was so serious it is doubtful that he would have come to grips with it. I mean, he was still denying that he was addicted right up until the time that he was sentenced. So I'm not so sure that incarceration is all bad, even for drug offenders, depending on the facts. I think there are some --

Q I meant --

THE PRESIDENT: Let me finish. I think the sentences in many cases are too long for non-violent offenders. I think the sentences are too long and the facilities are not structured to maximize success when the people get out. Keep in mind, 90 percent of the people that are in the penitentiary are going to get out. So society's real interest is

seeing that we maximize the chance that when they get out, that they can go back to being productive citizens, that they'll get jobs, they'll pay taxes, they'll be good fathers and mothers, that they'll do good things.

I think this whole thing needs to be re-examined. Even in the federal system, these sentencing guidelines --

Q You've got mandatory minimums -- would you do away with those?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, most judges think we should. I certainly think they should be re-examined. And the disparities are unconscionable between crack and powdered cocaine. I tried to change the disparities and the Republican Congress was willing to narrow, but not eliminate, them on the theory that people who use crack are more violent than people who use cocaine. Well, what they really meant was that people who use crack are more likely to be poor and, coincidentally, black or brown and, therefore, not have money. Whereas, people who use cocaine were more likely to be rich, pay for it and therefore be peaceable.

But my own view is if you do something violent, it's appropriate to have an incarceration. But I think we need a serious re-examination in the view toward what would make us a more peaceful, more productive society. I think some of this, our imprisonment policies, are counterproductive. And now, you know, you have in a lot of places where, before the economy picked up, prison-building was a main source of economic activity and prison employment was one of the big areas of job growth.

Q Do you think people should lose access to college loans because they've been convicted of smoking pot? Which is now law.

THE PRESIDENT: No. I think that, first of all --

Q I mean, those are people that seem to need a loan the most.

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I don't believe, by and large, in permanent lifetime penalties. There is a bill in Congress today that has bipartisan support that I was hoping would pass before I left office, but I feel confident it will in the next year or two -- which would restore voting rights to people after their full sentences have been discharged and they wouldn't have to apply for a federal pardon to get it. I changed the law in Arkansas -- when I was attorney general I changed the voting rights law in 1977, to restore voting rights to people when they had discharged their sentence. And my state is one of the relatively few states in the country where you do not have to get a pardon from the governor to register to vote again -- or from the federal government, for that matter.

Look, it depends on what your theory is. But I don't believe in making people wear a chain for life. If they get a sentence from a jury, if they serve it under the law, if they discharge their sentence, the rest of us have an interest in a safe society, in a successful society and seeing that these folks go back to productive lives. You know, keeping

them with a scarlet letter on their forehead for the rest of their lives, and a chain around their neck, is not very productive.

Q Just to wrap this up, do you think that we need a major re-think of what these drug sentencing laws are?

THE PRESIDENT: Not just drugs. I think we need to look at who's in prison, what are the facts --

Q Well, they're filled with drug prisoners, these jails.

THE PRESIDENT: -- most of them are related to drug or alcohol abuse, but there are some non-violent offenders unrelated to drug or alcohol abuse -- which is not to say that I don't think white collar criminals should ever go to jail. But I think we need to examine -- the natural tendency of the American people, because most of us are law-abiding, is to think when somebody does something bad, we ought to put them in jail and throw the key away.

And what I think is we need a discriminating view. There are some people who should be put in jail and throw the key away, because they can't help hurting other people. And I believe that one of the reasons for the declining crime rate is that we have a higher percentage of the people in jail who commit a lot of the crimes; a very small percentage of the people are multiple, habitual criminals. And if you could get a significant percentage of them in jail, the crime rate goes way down.

Now, on the other hand, there are a whole lot of other people in jail who will never commit another crime, particularly if they have -- if they get free of drugs or free of their alcohol abuse, and if they education and training and if somebody will give them a job and give them another chance.

And what I think we need is a serious re-examination of what we've done, because we've done a lot of good in identifying people who are habitual criminals and keeping them in prison longer, and that's one of the reasons that the crime rate has gone down, along with community policing and improving the economy. But we also have just captured a whole lot of people who are in jail, I think, longer than they need to be in prison, and then get out without adequate drug treatment, job training or job placement.

But the society is moving on this. I notice now back in Washington there is a really good program where -- maybe two, that I know -- where they try to keep people who go to prison in touch with their children, and they use the Internet so they can e-mail back and forth. They try to, in other words, not cut people off so completely that they lose all hope and all incentive of returning to normal life and they try not to damage these kids so badly, to reduce the chances that the kids will follow in their parents' footsteps.

Q Let me change the subject.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we need a whole new look at that. The

sentencing guidelines, the disparities, are only a part of it. We have to look at how long should certain people go to prison from the point of view of what's good for society. We need to completely rethink it. Because criminal laws and sentencing tend to be passed sort of seriatim in response to social problems at the moment.

Q You, in general, restored judicial discretion and replace the kind of panic legislation that was passed about crack or --

THE PRESIDENT: The reasons for the sentencing guidelines in the first place was to try to reduce the arbitrary harshness. It wasn't because they wanted to make sure everybody went to jail for a while; it was because the citizen guidelines tended to be abusive on the other end of the spectrum.

I think we may need some sentencing guidelines, but I think the impact, the practical impact of the ones we have has led to some people going to prison for longer than they should and longer than they would have under the old system. So there should be some more flexibility than there is.

Q I'm going to change the subject. The Balkans was your only major military engagement. What was it like to run a war night after night? I mean, was it your mentality in feeling that as all of that was going on as you go to sleep every night?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I went to sleep every night praying that it would end that night and that Milosevic would give in, praying that no other --

Q You were literally praying?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Praying that nobody would die, no American would die, and hoping that no innocent civilians would die -- but knowing that they would.

You know, it's easy for people to talk about war when it's appropriate to use military force, but you have to know that once human beings start using big, powerful weapons, there will be unintended consequences. We wound up bombing the Chinese embassy, innocent people died. We hit a school bus. And we have the most skilled Air Force and the most sophisticated weapons in all human history.

In the Gulf War, which is normally thought of as a hundred-hour war, and a model of sort of technical proficiency, we had four and a half months to settle in and prepare there and still a lot of the American casualties were from friendly fire. The same thing happened even in the small engagement in Grenada, and President Reagan. These things happen. There are -- once you start killing people, there will be unintended consequences.

Q How do you get yourself personally comfortable -- I mean, how do you get yourself, as a person and as a politician, ready to make that decision with a level of comfort you're now going to go ahead and do

this?

THE PRESIDENT: You have to be convinced that the consequences of inaction would be more damaging to more people and to your country. And in the case of Kosovo, I didn't think it was a close case. They had already killed several thousand Kosovars and they were running a million of them out of their homes, 800,000. It was a clean case of ethnic cleansing.

And I thought the United States and our European allies had to stand up against it; we couldn't let it happen in the heart of Europe. If we did that, we would lose the ability to stop it anywhere else.

Q And wouldn't it be on your conscience in some way, for having failed to stop it?

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. Look, it took us -- one of the things that just tore at me -- and in the end it didn't require much military engagement, although it required some -- was how long it took me to build a consensus. It took me two years to build a consensus among our allies for military action in Bosnia. And you know, what happened there was, after the slaughter at Srebrenica we finally got -- you know, everybody said, okay, let's go -- we did a few air strikes and all of a sudden we were at Dayton and the peace talks. And for all the raggedness of it, the Bosnian peace has held and it's better now, because we turned back the tide of ethnic cleansing.

But over 200,000 people died there. And I just knew, you know, there is no point in letting it happen again in Kosovo.

Q How do you feel, then, about Rwanda? I mean, clearly it's a difference -- you didn't have the allies, you didn't have intelligence, all kinds of things. Is there anything that we could have done to prevent it? And whether there was or not, it happened while you were President -- do you feel any responsibility in that, personally?

THE PRESIDENT: I feel terrible about it. One of the reasons that I went to Tanzania to be with Mandela and try to talk to the Burundians into the peace agreement -- because before my time, over 200,000 people were killed in Burundi. Same deal -- the Hutus and the Tutsis, same tribes, fighting the same battles.

In Rwanda, the thing that was shocking about Rwanda was that it happened so fast and it happened with almost no guns. The idea that 700,000 people could be killed in a hundred days, mostly with machetes, is hard to believe. It was an alien territory, we weren't familiar. After that, we began working very earnestly in Africa to train troops to be able to go in and prevent such things. We worked very hard with something called the Africa Crisis Response Initiative.

And when I was in Senegal I actually went out of Dakar to another city to watch a training exercise -- at least a parade exercise -- and talk to the troops from Senegal, that our American soldiers were working with. We are now working with the Ghanaian forces and Nigerian forces to

give them the training and the capacity to prevent the resumption of the slaughter of Sierra Leone.

So I think that -- I hope the United States will be much, much more involved in Africa from now on, and everywhere. In economic development, we passed the Africa Trade bill this year; in fighting AIDS, TB, malaria in Africa; in debt relief, we passed a big debt relief legislation this year; and in helping them to develop the mechanisms to do this.

The African countries have leaders who are willing to go in and take their responsibility in these areas if we'll give them the logistical and other support necessary to do it, if they're trained to do it. That's what happened in East Timor, where we didn't have to put troops on the ground, but we sent 500 people over there and provided vital air lift and logistical and other support, so that the Australians and New Zealanders and the other troops that came in could bring an end to the slaughter there.

So I think that there is -- there is sort of a sliding scale here. In Europe it had to be done by NATO and the scale of it and the power of the Serbian government was such that if we hadn't been directly involved with our NATO allies, we never could have turned it back and Milosevic never would have fallen. If we hadn't stopped him in Bosnia and Kosovo and kept the sanctions on, the people would never have had the chance to vote him out.

So I feel good about that. I wish we had been -- Rwanda, if we had done all the things we've done since Rwanda and Africa -- training the troops, supporting them, working with them, what I think would have happened is the African troops would have moved in, they would have stopped it and we could have given them the logistical support they needed to stop it.

Now, there are other problems that may develop --

Q Another reason to vote for Gore.

THE PRESIDENT: Another huge reason to vote for Gore, because, you know, Governor Bush has said that he doesn't think that's the business of the American military, we're only supposed to fight and win wars and let everybody else do this. He kept talking about Kosovo, I noticed, in a way as if we were the only forces in Kosovo. We were only 15 percent of the soldiers in Kosovo.

Q Let me change the subject, back to Washington. Why do you think you were such a lightning rod for partisanship and bitterness and so much hatred during your term now?

THE PRESIDENT: I think there were a lot of reasons. I think mostly it's just because I won. The Republicans really didn't -- they believe the only reason they lost in '76 to Jimmy Carter was because of Watergate. They believe that, from the time Mr. Nixon won in '68, they had found a fool-proof formula to hold the White House forever, until some

third party came on. That's what they believe.

Q Did you ever hear anybody articulate that, the Republicans --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, in so many words. I had a very candid relationship with a lot of those guys. They would tell me what was going on. I think they really believed that America saw Republicans as the guarantor of the country's security and values and prudence in financial matters. And that they could always turn Democrats into cardboard cut-outs of what they really were, they could sort of caricature them as almost un-American; and that basically the Congress might be Democratic most of the time because the Congress would give things to the American people. But the Republicans embodied the values, the strength, the heritage of the country and they could always sort of do, as I said about Dukakis, reverse plastic surgery any Democrat.

So I came along and I had ideas on crime and welfare and economic management and foreign policy that were difficult for them to characterize in that way. And we won. And they were really mad. I think I was the first President in a long time that never got a day's honeymoon -- I mean, they started on me the next day. I think that was one thing.

I think, secondly, I was the first baby boomer President, not a perfect person, never planned to be -- I mean, never claimed to be -- and had opposed the Vietnam war. So I think that made them doubly angry because they thought I was a cultural alien and I made it anyway.

Q Do you think that the cultural --

THE PRESIDENT: -- Southern Baptist, because the dominant culture of the Republican Party -- President Reagan put a nicer image on it. But the dominant culture were basically white Southern Protestant men who led the surge of the new Republican Party, first under President Nixon and the silent majority and, you know, blue collar people -- and then it came to an apotheosis under President Reagan.

So I think that, you know, they didn't like losing the White House and they didn't like me and they didn't like what they thought I represented. And that all happened at the time you had this huge growth in conservative talk shows and these -- you know, sort of associated think tanks and groups and networks that grew up in Washington from the time of Nixon through the time of Bush.

And I think they had sort of a permanent alternative government set up by that time. And they went to war the first day of my presidency.

Q Because you were the most threatening politically and they despised what you represented culturally, age-wise and --

THE PRESIDENT: -- think they honestly disagreed with me on a lot of the issues as well, but a lot of it was they were mad they weren't in, which is one of the reasons they're working so hard now. And one of the big challenges that we face in the closing days of this election is to

motivate the people that agree with us to the level that they're motivated. Just because they've been out a long time, they want back in really badly.

Q Were you surprised about the difficulties you had in your own party with Sam Nunn on the gays thing and Moynihan on health care and Kerrey on the economic plan?

THE PRESIDENT: Not particularly, because -- I'll come back to the gays in the military.

Q Don't, because we've run through that. But just insofar as Nunn?

THE PRESIDENT: No. And the answer to that is, no, because a lot of the Democrats who were culturally conservative and pro military thought that gays in the military coming up so early was inconsistent with the whole new Democratic approach we were taking. Plus, which they thought I was wrong.

But as I explained to you, I think when we talked last, I didn't bring it up first; Bob Dole did.

Now, on the other issues, the fundamental problems there was that there were no easy answers. I mean, Bob Kerrey comes from Nebraska. He and Jim Exon were Democrats, but Nebraska is one of the most Republican states in the country and I think, you know, he thought we should have maybe cut spending a little more or raised taxes a little less, or cut taxes a little less on lower income working people so we wouldn't have to raise it as much, you know. And I think -- and we'd been through that tough presidential campaign.

Q These guys were like, you know, the party elders.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Moynihan believed --

Q Generally, they should like say, well, he's our new president. That's --

THE PRESIDENT: But I didn't take offense to that. Moynihan believed, first of all, with some justification, that he knew more about most areas of social policy than anybody else did. I think he thought we were making a political mistake not to do welfare reform first, which turned out to be right. We did make a political mistake not to do welfare reform first.

And, secondly, I think he felt that the system in Washington could not absorb in a two-year period the economic plan which he strongly supported. He was terrific. The NAFTA trade agreement, which he strongly supported, which was controversial within our party, and then this major health care thing. He really didn't believe and he's told me that, you know, he said, you know, we just don't have time to do these. He said, the system cannot absorb this much change in this short a time.

And, you know, that was a mistake I made. Hillary gets a bum rap for that. That was basically my fault. Because I knew that basically there's only two ways to get to universal coverage. You either have to have a taxpayer subsidy, which is what we've done now with the Children's Health Insurance Program, because now we've got the number of uninsured people going down in America for the first time in a dozen years, primarily because in the Balanced Budget Act, we insisted -- the Democrats did -- on getting the Children's Health Insurance Program, which is the biggest expansion of government financed health care since Medicaid. You either have to do it that way or you have to have an employer mandate where the employers have to provide the health insurance and then you exempt smaller businesses and subsidize that somewhat.

Q You --

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't take offense at it. You know, they thought I was being bull-headed and I think, in retrospect, they were probably right.

Q What was your relationship with Newt like?

THE PRESIDENT: I had an unusual relationship with him. First of all --

Q Was it --

THE PRESIDENT: It depended on which Newt showed up. But I thought the good Newt, I found engaging, intelligent, and that we were surprisingly in agreement in the way we viewed the world.

Q -- similar --

THE PRESIDENT: Partly. But, you know, Newt supported me in virtually all of my foreign policy initiatives. And after he got his Congress, he realized that a hundred of them had never had a passport.

I remember him calling me once wanting me to get them to go on foreign missions. He said, if you ask them, then they can't be attacked back home for boondoggle trips. So we actually had a very cordial relationship.

He was also very candid with me about his political objectives. And he, in turn, from time to time, would get in trouble with the right wing of his own caucus because they said I could talk him in to too much. We had a pretty good relationship.

You know, on the other hand, as I told you, when he did things like blaming every bad thing that happened in America on Democrats in the 1960s and all that, I thought it was highly destructive.

Q How did he make you feel, personally?

THE PRESIDENT: At some point, probably around 1996, I got to the point where I no longer had personal feelings about those things. But,

you know, things like the Whitewater investigation and the Travel Office investigation, he was smart; he knew there was nothing in that stuff. It was all politics to him. It was about power.

But he really did believe that the object of politics was to destroy your opponent. And, you know, he ran Jim Wright out of the Congress on account of that. That's what he thought he was doing. And he had an enormous amount of success in the beginning and he won the Congress basically by having that take-no-prisoners, be-against-everything approach.

Q Didn't he tell you once on the phone that he was planning to lead a revolution against you?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he thought he was leading a revolution and I was in the way. And I think he really believed, after '94 --

Q What did you think when he says this to you? I'm out there to destroy -- I'm going to take you on, you're through.

THE PRESIDENT: I thought he was a worthy adversary and I thought I would defeat him, because I thought the American people would stick with me. But I thought he was a very worthy adversary.

I think he thought that he could create, for the rest of my presidency, a sort of an almost a parliamentary system where he would be the prime minister and make the policy and I'd be in charge of foreign policy and he'd help me.

Q I mean, historically, the Newt versus Bill, I was just trying to think back, there hasn't been as powerful -- I mean, powerful and as antagonistic a Speaker to the President, not in modern times. You had an actual enemy. You had somebody actually out there daily fighting you, not a -- not a Lyndon, not a McCormack. Everybody went with Reagan and gave him what he wanted.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what they decided to do. And, you know, now I have a Speaker in Hastert I can really work with. We've got a lot done. But he still has -- the dominant power in the caucus is Tom Delay and Dick Armey. And if they had their druthers, you know, they'd still follow that approach. But the balance of authority is so -- power is so close in the House that more often than not, we work things out.

But in the Senate, you've got the same thing with Lott. You know, Lott I have a very cordial personal relationship with, I have a lot in common with Lott in terms of our background and childhood and, you know, that whole thing. His daddy was a laboring person. He could have well been a Democrat.

Q How did you develop your strategy in sort of dealing with Newt and outflanking him? Just wait him out, give him enough rope?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's part of it. You know, I felt after they won that when the people actually saw the fine print on their

contract, they would think that there was a contract on America instead of a contract with America. And then I felt that I had to oppose them when I thought they were wrong. But I couldn't let them push me back into the old confrontation where they could say, Clinton's an old Democrat, he's defending everything, even the indefensible, so you may think we're going too far, but America has to change. Because this is a country in constant change. So that was -- for example, instead of just fighting them on the budget, I offered my own balanced budget.

Q I mean, everybody -- I think Democrats really wanted to attack him back as quickly as possible, and you took a much more conciliatory --

THE PRESIDENT: That's because I felt they had to have a chance to run their -- and then when we got to the government shutdown, I wasn't just against what they were doing, I had an alternative. See, I believe -- and I think it's more important, I think it's easier for Republicans to be against everything than Democrats because people view us as the party of affirmative government. And since I believed in balancing the budget, I just didn't want to do it the way they wanted to.

Q What's your bottom line on Newt historically? I mean, what's your -- if you were an historian, what would you say about Gingrich?

THE PRESIDENT: That he was immensely successful in, first of all, consolidating the power of the Republican Party and its right wing, and then in winning the Congress, winning the historic struggle for Congress in '94 by opposing me right down the line. And in '94, the people -- the economy was getting better but people didn't feel it yet. The budget we passed did not impose great tax burdens on ordinary Americans but they didn't know it yet. And the crime bill we passed was going to help bring the crime rate down without interfering with people's gun rights, but they didn't know it yet.

So you had the best of all times to run through a gaping hole. And then I had made the mistake of trying to do both -- trying to do the economic plan and NAFTA, which dispirited some of our base supporters. And then I tried to do health care under circumstances that were literally impossible. You could not get a universal coverage plan passed through Congress.

So I made a lot of errors and he ran through them and he therefore changed the Congress. Then I think people will say that we had one of these historic battles that periodically happens in America about the role of the national government and, indeed, what the meaning of the nation is.

And I think he thought he could actually carry out the revolution that President Reagan talked about, you know, drastically shrinking the federal government, drastically limiting its ability to act in the social sphere and moving it to the right.

And to me, we had a series of battles that were really the latest

incarnation of this age-old battle of what does it mean to be an American, what is the idea of America, what is the purpose of a nation? And there was a government shutdown, there was an impeachment, there was my veto of the Newt tax bill after Newt was gone. All these were ongoing battles.

The battle over -- the same thing is now happening, shaping up over the courts. The most important issue in this election may well be what happens to the courts. Because there is now already -- we are one vote away from having enough votes that would repeal *Roe v. Wade*.

But there is this other issue in the courts which I think is quite profound, which is there are five votes right now to restrict the ability of Congress to require the states to participate in protecting the American people in a lot of fundamental ways. So I think this is an ongoing battle.

But it's the same battle that we had between George Washington and John Adams and Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall on the one side and Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Payne and a lot of other people on the other in the beginning. The same battle Abraham Lincoln had around the time of the Civil War, could the states secede, did the federal government have the power to enslave them. The same battle we had at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution when Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson asserted the authority of the nation to proscribe basic conditions in the workplace and protection.

And it was the same battle that Franklin Roosevelt fought. That was the fourth time it was fought. Now we're in the fifth battle over how to define America. And in the first three skirmishes, we won. But I see that as a big issue in this election, a huge issue.

Q Let's talk about impeachment a little. You're going to -- in the history books, it's going to say of course that you were the second President ever to be impeached. How does that make you feel? Do you feel that that will cloud your real accomplishments?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's for the historians to determine. The history books will also record, I think, that both impeachments were wrong and that's when they failed. And I'm just grateful that, unlike Andrew Johnson, I was less embittered by it and I had more support from the public and in the Congress, so I was able to resume my duties and actually get a lot done for the American people in the aftermath.

Q Was there ever a point where you wanted to give up or it just became too hard?

THE PRESIDENT: Never.

Q Did you ever get so angry during it that you think it clouded your judgment?

THE PRESIDENT: I got angry, but I always was alone or with friends who would deflate me, so I don't think it ever clouded my judgment on any official thing I took.

You know, I realized that when it was all over, I would have the responsibility to work with the Republicans, as well as the Democrats. One of the things I had to learn -- as I said, it took me almost my whole first term to learn it -- is that at some point presidents are not permitted to have personal feelings. When you manifest your anger in public, it should be on behalf of the American people and the values that they believe and the things they do.

You just can't -- a lot of this stuff you can't take personally. And especially when I realized that, for the people that were directing it, it was just politics. You know, it was about power and politics. So I was largely able to purge myself of it. And I had very strong personal feelings about it, but I tried never to talk about it, I tried to get up every day and just do my job and let others defend me publicly and go on with the work of the country, because --

Q -- in private?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, because presidents will always be under siege in some way or another. And if you don't want the job and the attendant heat, you shouldn't ask for it.

Q Does it make you uncomfortable to talk about this episode now?

THE PRESIDENT: I just think the less I say about it right now, the better. I think the more time passes, the more people will see what happens and the more it will come out. There have been some pretty good books written about it.

Q What do you think of Ken Starr now?

THE PRESIDENT: I think he did what he was hired to do.

Q You told me you never really met him and had no ill feelings?

THE PRESIDENT: I met him. You know, I met him once when he interviewed me. He was hired to keep the impeachment thing -- I mean, to keep the inquiry going past the '96 election, and to do whatever damage he could. That's why he was put in, and he did what they asked him to do.

Q What's your take on Henry Hyde? Who was supposedly Mr. Reasonable? And then he seemed to defy the will of the people after the '98 elections, where he kind of got repudiated.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he did what he was hired to do, too. I mean, the right wing was in control of the Congress, and they thought they had paid in '98 and they thought they would never have to pay again. They thought it was a free shot to put a hit on me and so they did. I don't think it's complicated.

Q Once the elections were done, I remember seeing you a

week before, and clearly Democrats were going to take the House in a way they had never taken it before in an off election. And it was a referendum on this issue, and then they went ahead -- him and the Republican leadership went ahead despite that. What does that tell you about them?

THE PRESIDENT: That they wanted to -- they stayed with their right wing, and they thought they would pay no price in 2000 because they thought whatever happened it would all be over by now. And they thought they could put a black mark on me in history, and that was really important to them. They were really angry. They got beat. They were just angry, and they thought they had paid once and they wouldn't have to pay this time, because the American people would move on to other things as they always do. And so they did it.

Q It's not an issue now in this election, really.

THE PRESIDENT: It is in three or four House seats, but not many.

Q It's an issue to me.

THE PRESIDENT: But it shouldn't be. I've tried -- the only way it should be an issue in the election is that it indicates how important it is if they should maintain their majority they have somebody in the White House that can restrain them. Because it's just an example of other things they were doing to the environmental laws of the country, to the education laws, to the health care system. That's the only way it should be an issue. It's over, the American people shouldn't be expected to dwell on it. They shouldn't have to deal with it.

Q Who do you think really came through for you and got up and defended you?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, tons of people. The House Judiciary Committee Democrats were really good. There were 800 people, including a lot of Republicans who didn't even like me, who filed testimony talking about how inappropriate it was. Then there was that bipartisan panel of career prosecutors who said that no one would bring any criminal charges on this. So a lot of people who came forward who had no particular reason to do it, but who cared about their country and were offended by what was going on.

Q Do you think in some way this is sort of a referendum on sort of the nature of morality or the character of America in some way?

THE PRESIDENT: Not really. No, I think people strongly disagree with what I did. I did, too. I think the -- I don't think the -- I think that they just were able to discriminate between a bad personal mistake and the justification for a Constitutional crisis. I think -- I don't think that it -- I think it said more about their ability to discriminate between two different kinds of problems than any changed moral standards.

Q In the '60s we always talked -- still they talk about karma, you know your karma? Did you ever look at it in terms of what's in my karma that I got this shit-hammer dropped on me?

THE PRESIDENT: No. Like I said -- no, I don't. If I hadn't made a personal mistake, they wouldn't have the pretext to do what they did, even though what they did was wrong. So no, I don't.

Q Do you think it benefitted us, that process, that we learned from all that, from the impeachment process?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the one thing it did was it pointed out all the other excesses. You know, that there was a bogus Whitewater investigation. It was totally bogus and wasted money and --

Q What was that?

THE PRESIDENT: The Whitewater investigation. That civil lawsuit against me was bogus. Even the judge who was famous for disliking me personally threw it out as having no merit. So I think that what it did was, at least for the time being, it took a lot of the venom out of our public life. You know, even as hard as George Bush and Al Gore are hitting each other now in this election, they are by and large hitting at each other over the issues. I mean, Bush has got some ad up now questioning Gore's integrity, which is amazing that Bush would question Gore's integrity, but anyway.

But he knows that there's a certain number of voters who vote for Republicans because they're convinced that they're morally superior to Democrats, notwithstanding the fact that we're awash in evidence now that they're not. And so he's doing that, but there has been very little of that, even from him. They're basically -- the level of venom is lower than it was. And maybe I absorbed enough for several years.

And if so, then that alone might make it worth doing. Because I think it's just crazy for America with all these fabulous opportunities and some pretty stiff challenges out there to waste our elections and our public officials' time with things that we know are bogus or trivial and cost the taxpayers a fortune, for no other purpose than for one side to pursue political advantage over another. There will always be some of that, but my instinct is that in the next four years we'll have a lot less of it.

Q The press -- as President, you have a relationship with the press that is unique to anybody in the world. You, as an individual, there's certainly more scrutiny or criticism or attention, more everything. What's your take on the press in America?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that, first of all, it's very difficult to generalize. I think that on the balance, it's a great advantage for the President to have a bully pulpit that can reach everyone in America and everyone in the world instantaneously. And any criticisms that a President has about negative press or incessant carping or whatever -- you've got to temper that with the fact that they make it possible for you to do your job in a communications age.

And they work -- especially the working press, I have an enormous

amount of respect for them. I mean these people that are on this airplane, because I've worked hard and I keep long hours, it's a hard job for them, because they have to -- they go around in the vans, not in Air Force One or the helicopters. They have a lot of hard work to do, and I think by and large, most of them do it as well as they can and as honestly as they can. I have an enormous amount of respect for them.

Now, there's another part of the press that are kind of part of almost a celebrity political press that are -- that go all the way from the columnists to the people that are on all these talk shows all the time. And they have, in order for them to be successful, their comments have to have edge. They tend to be more negative and more dogmatic in their attempts to be -- and sometimes there is more heat than light in a lot of what's said in a lot of those forums, formats. But that's part of the new age we're living in.

And also they're sort of on the cutting edge between the serious press, the tabloid press and pure political advocacy and entertainment. You've got all these segments now that are kind of blurred together, compounded by a 24 hour news cycle, and the fact that there are umpty-dump channels people can watch, some of which are news channels that know they have to go after narrowly segmented markets, and they're targeting certain audiences.

So it's a very different press environment, and if you took it all seriously, it would run you nuts. But you can't -- once you realize kind of what the environment is, you just learn to deal with it. I think the important thing is, too -- for Presidents, especially -- to try to hear the criticism, because it's not always wrong. Sometimes it's right. I find it easier, really, when it comes from thoughtful columnists who are really trying to make a serious contribution to the national debate. Even in some other forums it's important.

Q Which columnists or reporters do you think have been particularly good or particularly smart in their coverage of you in the last eight years?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think just in terms of columnists I think Tom Friedman is the best foreign policy writer we have today, by a long stretch. I think he understands the world we're living in and the one toward which we're moving. Therefore, whether he's criticizing me or analyzing an issue or whatever he's doing, he's trying to do it from a completely honest point of view of trying to say, here's where the world is, here's where we're going.

I think Ron Brownstein is one of the best political columnists in America today, one of the two or three best. He's truly extraordinary. And you know, he understands this whole new Democrat movement that I have been a part of. He understood the ideas that underlay the '92 campaign and the whole Democratic Leadership Council effort. Everything we're trying to do. And he made it his business to study that. I think he's very good.

I think E.J. Dionne is good. I regret that his other

responsibilities at the Post don't give him time to write more columns, because I think he's very good.

Q -- towards the Times for their role in Whitewater?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I think that -- it was sort of like this Wen Ho Lee deal in a way. I mean, the same guy got a story and it was kind of overwritten and dire things were predicted. But I think whatever I feel about that, it has to be tempered by the fact that the Times has a serious conscience when it comes to the national issues. I don't think the -- I think they had a -- they really have tried consistently to think -- on the public issues, I think they really have done an excellent job of analysis and are trying to come out in the right place in the right way. So whatever I feel about that is tempered by that.

Q Do you think institutionally it's working right, the press as a whole, the major newspapers, the networks and so forth?

THE PRESIDENT: I think they're doing the best they can in a very new and different environment. I have a lot of sympathy with them.

Q So you don't have resentment towards them? Like, a lot of Presidents just hated -- once done, they just hated them.

THE PRESIDENT: No. Absolutely not. You know, how can Presidents hate the press? I mean, they give you -- you can gripe all you want about all the negative coverage you get on the evening news or on these talk shows or being blasted in the newspaper or having to get on something where they're dead wrong, like on Whitewater, whatever it is -- dead wrong, but still, every day they're right in all kinds of other things about all the things that affect the American people and their lives.

And anytime you want a microphone to have your say, you've got it. So I think to be obsessively negative is a mistake.

Q What creature comforts are you going to miss the most about leaving the White House, not living there?

THE PRESIDENT: The movie theater, the swimming pool, Camp David. Everybody says I'll miss Air Force One the most once I have to return to commercial travel. But what I will miss the most is not the creature comforts, it's the honor of living in the White House, which I have loved. I've loved living there, because I love my country, I love the history of my country. I know -- I was a pretty good American historian before I got there, and I know a lot more than I did then and I've read a lot about Presidents that most people don't know much about, including me before I got there.

And even more than that, I'll miss the work. It's the job I'll miss the most. I love the work. I actually have loved doing this job.

Q Do you just get off every single day when you get up, just -- I am so lucky?

THE PRESIDENT: Even the worst day. Even in the worst times -- the whole impeachment thing -- I just thank God every day I can go to work. I love the job. I've always loved it.

Q Looking at the other side of the coin, what -- is there anything that seems attractive to you about not living there anymore?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I look forward to kind of having -- being a citizen again. It will be the first time in 20 years -- you know, I've been -- I was governor for 12 years, and 10 years, the last 10 years in a row -- so it will be the first time in 18 years that I've really had a private home that was my primary residence, and where I'll get up every day, feeling a responsibility to be of public service, but knowing that I'm basically in control of my life again. And it will be an interesting challenge for me. Eighteen years is a long time to be a chief executive, living in public housing, with every day scripted out -- you know, hours and hours a day, particularly if you work like I do.

It's a challenge, and I'm going to be interested to see whether I can meet it and what it means, you know, to go into this next chapter of my life. I'm actually excited about it.

Q What's the one thing about being -- what's the one thing that would surprise either Bush or Gore about being President that they just can't know now? What was the greatest surprise to you? What advice would you give the next President?

THE PRESIDENT: I think they will be surprised how many different things happen at once. Now, Al won't be as surprised by that, because he's been there eight years. It's another good argument for voting for him, because he's experienced and he makes good decisions. He'll be a very good President if he wins. He'll be quite good. He makes good decisions. And he's had experience. And the environment, I think, will be less hostile for either one of them than it was for me, and they will have more of an opportunity to craft cooperative solutions.

Because almost under any conceivable scenario, the Congress will be even more closely divided than it is now. You know, the Democrats are going to pick up some seats in the Senate. They might even be in control. But if they are, they will just have a one-seat majority here, too, and I think the Democrats will win the House. But if they do, they won't have any bigger majority than the Republicans do now. Maybe a little more, but not much. So you will have a very closely divided government which will require them to all work together.

So I think they may have a less hostile environment than I did, and I hope they do, but I think they'll still be surprised at how many different things they'll have crash in on them at once.

Q What would you tell them to do -- you say, look, here's what you've got to do as the next President. Here's what I would like you to do.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I think after the election,

they ought to get more rest than I did. You know, I didn't really take a vacation. I think they ought to clear their heads. I would advise them to work as hard as they can to get a good Cabinet and a good staff, and then really emphasize teamwork; and when you come to the tough decisions, do what you think is right.

A lot of these decisions, you know, that were unpopular that I made -- Bosnia, Haiti, debt relief in Mexico, taking on the NRA, doing the debt thing -- reducing the deficit, I mean. Right now, it's like smooth sailing. But it's just not in the nature of human existence to be free of difficulty. And I think when you come down to those tough decisions, you just have to do what you think is right, tell the American people why you did it, and hope they'll go along with you.

Q So this comes out after the election. So do you want to -- give me a prediction.

THE PRESIDENT: I've always believed Gore will win, and I still do. And I think if he doesn't, the only reason that I think that he might not win is if they vote -- a higher percentage of the people that want Bush to be President vote than the percentage of people that want Gore to be President. But I believe if we get an even turnout, I think in the closing days of this election, people will begin to think about whether they really want to risk this prosperity by adopting an economic plan that has a huge tax cut, a huge Social Security privatization program and a bunch of spending that will put us back into deficit.

I think that people have to think about whether they want to risk having nobody to restrain a Republican Congress if they should stay in the majority, and I think they will think about what will happen to the courts.

And so I think that those things will be enough to put Al Gore over, and I think he'll be elected.

Q What do you think the margin is going to be -- the popular vote?

THE PRESIDENT: I have no idea. I think it will be -- it will definitely be close in the popular vote; whether it's close in the electoral vote depends on what happens -- there's a dozen states it could go either way. So either one of -- there could be a sizeable electoral victory, it could be --

Q Predict Florida for me. Predict Missouri, Pennsylvania, Michigan.

THE PRESIDENT: I think Gore will win Florida, Pennsylvania and Michigan. I've always thought Gore would win Florida. We've worked like crazy there for eight years, and we've done a lot for Florida and a lot with Florida, and Joe Lieberman has helped a lot in Florida. So I think Gore will win Florida, I think he will win Pennsylvania, I think he will win Michigan, and I think he will win Missouri if Mrs. Carnahan is the choice of the Missouri people for senator.

Q And Washington State?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll win in Washington.

Q I don't want to take any of your money on that. Did you see the cover on AI -- that the Rolling Stone that's gotten so much talk?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q It took hours to do that interview. I just used -- eat up hours of his time. I appreciate your time very much.

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks.

END 4:15 P.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-DEC-2000 10:21:00.00

SUBJECT: 12/7 Press Guidance

TO: Ronald Minsk (CN=Ronald Minsk/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP on
12/18/2000 10:20 AM -----

Jenni R. Engebretsen
12/07/2000 03:36:16 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 12/7 Press Guidance

Press Guidance
Thursday, December 7, 2000

Domestic/Economic

1. Budget/CR
2. Drug Sentencing (also pls see today's Siewert briefing)
3. Education
4. Forest Legacy
5. Oil
6. Turkey/Summers Statement

- Forest Legacy Guidance Document.doc - forestleprsrls6.wpd
- prls1064.doc

Foreign

1. Afghanistan/Taliban
2. Burma
3. Cyber Networks
4. Don't Ask, Don't Tell (new)
5. Ethiopia-Eritrea Peace Accord
6. ICC Negotiations (draft/new)
7. Iraq Oil
8. Liberia (new)
9. MEPP
10. NATO (new)
11. Northern Ireland/Killings in North Belfast (new)

12. Northern Ireland/POTUS Trip (updated)
13. Northern Ireland/Real IRA
14. North Korea
15. Peru/Shining Path (new)
16. Romanian Elections (new)
17. Russia/Cohen-Sergeyev on Aide Memoire (draft/new)
18. Russia/Pope Trial (updated)
19. US-EU/Beef and Bananas (new)
20. Venezuela/Chavez on Bolivia and Ecuador (new)
21. Yemen/Cole Investigation (updated)

Message Sent

To:

Valerie J. Owens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary Ellen Countryman/NSC/EOP@EOP
Emil J. Barth/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Oliver D. Pangborn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leah M. Bryner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas L. Freedman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Drew T. Gardiner/WHO/EOP@EOP
David W. Beier/OVP/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP/EOP@EOP
Charles W. Burson/OVP/EOP@EOP
Craig A. Minassian/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniela E. Nanau/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary F. Hanley/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nancy McFadden/OVP/EOP@EOP
Cheri L. Stockham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth E. Baylor/WHO/EOP@EOP
Samuel O. Spencer/OVP/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/OPD/EOP@EOP
David B. Stockwell/NSC/EOP@EOP
Elliot J. Diringer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kristen A. Triggs/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eric J. Morse/OPD/EOP@EOP
Angela Blake/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel R. Wilson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP

Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Key C. German/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP
Pamela P. Carpenter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Helen L. Langan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
Todd A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard Denniston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Audrey Choi/CEA/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brenda B. Costello/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jim Kohlenberger/OVP@OVP
Neal Lane/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP
Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian S. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Lauren K. Gillespie/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rebecca Hunter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lissa Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
jtrevino@who.eop.gov @ inet
David L. Evans/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather H. Howard/OPD/EOP@EOP

Zina C. Pierre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel R. Wilson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Rachael F. Goldfarb/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP
Andrew F. Schneider/OVP/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Reich/OVP/EOP@EOP
Jim Kohlenberger/OVP/EOP@EOP
Dan J. Taylor/OVP/EOP@EOP
Jason E. Hartke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Raj Adlakha/WHO/EOP@EOP
David L. Evans/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adam L. Rosman/WHO/EOP@EOP

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.001 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.002 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 3 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.003 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 3 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 4 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.004 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 4 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 5 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.005 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 5 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 6 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.006 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 6 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 7 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.007 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 7 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 8 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert NSREOP0202:[ATTACH.D82]SREOP02400036UX.008 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 8 =====

Critical Services Suffering Due to Republican Inaction on Budget

House Majority Whip Tom DeLay has suggested that rather than completing the work they should have finished by October 1st, Congressional Republicans may pass an unprecedented 18th continuing resolution that would freeze current funding levels into the next year. This means Republicans are prepared to turn their backs on a bipartisan agreement reached in November that included the largest one-year increase in education ever. Funding federal agencies at last year's level amounts to a net cut after inflation, and in many cases is already inhibiting the ability to provide critical services to the American people.

IMMEDIATE PROBLEMS IN DELIVERING GOVERNMENT SERVICES

- × **Delaying Service for Social Security Recipients:** Under an extended CR, the Social Security Administration will not be able to hire or train replacements for the 300 employees lost to retirement every month. With reduced staff and little overtime flexibility, SSA's ability to process disability claims and handle calls to the 1-800 telephone number will deteriorate seriously. For instance, claimants with disabilities will wait, on average, two months longer for a decision. In addition, SSA will be forced to delay grants to States under the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act, indefinitely delaying services for thousands of people with disabilities who want to return to work.
- × **Threatening Biomedical Research at NIH:** Forcing the National Institutes of Health to continue to operate under last year's budget level will slow the pace of cutting edge research and reduce the number of new research grants. The grants lost would cover both basic and clinical research for some of the most debilitating diseases and conditions, such as cancer, AIDS, Parkinson's and other diseases. In addition, NIH may not be able to initiate new clinical trials or special research programs, such as those that focus on health disparities, and may be required to reduce funding to existing grants. *"It would be a disaster for medical research and for public health,"* said Congressman John Porter (R-IL), chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that oversees NIH. [Kondracke, Roll Call, 12/4/00]
- × **School Districts Left Wondering if They Can Hire New Teachers:** Under an extended CR, school districts will be required to plan on level funding for the portion of their budgets they receive from Title I-Grants to Local Educational Agencies, which provide extra academic support for children in high-poverty schools. Title I grants support programs such as extended-day kindergarten; learning laboratories in mathematics, science, and computers; and other arrangements to extend and accelerate academic progress. Any action on the budget may come too late to have any effect for the coming school year. School districts make hiring decisions in the early spring, and after that time they will find it difficult to use any additional funds effectively to expand Title I programs and services for the fall of 2000. In addition, schools must know by early March what funds they will receive through the Class Size Reduction Act, otherwise decisions to hire new teachers cannot be made and existing teachers can not be notified about positions for the following year. In some states, such as California, State law requires notification of existing teachers by March 15.
- × **Atomic Energy Workers Waiting for Medical Compensation:** President Clinton worked with Congress to provide compensation and medical expenses to thousands of atomic energy workers who contracted cancers while building America's atomic arsenal. This fall, Congress passed legislation to establish the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation fund to help these workers, but Congress has not yet funded the program. A six-month CR will prevent the

Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services from moving forward with start-up activities and as a result, thousands of affected workers will not begin to receive benefits on July 31, 2001, as intended by Congress.

- × **Continued Hiring Freeze at the FBI:** A six-month CR would force the Federal Bureau of Investigation to continue a hiring freeze, and would eliminate funding provided by the November agreement for critical counter-terrorism and national security initiatives, including funds for electronic surveillance and intelligence. The FBI began FY 2001 with 561 vacancies, and that number is expected to grow to nearly 1,100 by February 2001 if a longer CR is passed.

FUTURE PROBLEMS LOOM IF BUDGET IS NOT PASSED

- × **Delaying Information on Financial Aid Awards for College Students:** More than five million students rely on federal aid to attend college and are depending on timely information about what their financial aid package will be for the fall of 2001. The Pell Grant fee schedule for the 2001-2002 academic year must, by law, be published no later than February 1, 2001. An extended CR would mean publishing these rates based on last year's funding level, which set the maximum award at \$500 lower than the level agreed to in November. Because colleges will be forced to provide information based on last year's funding levels, students who depend on federal aid to decide where to go to college, or whether they can afford to go at all, will not receive accurate or timely information about their financial aid package.
- × **Forcing Reduction in Number of Secret Service Agents:** A six-month CR would force funding cuts of \$34.5 million below the current level for the U.S. Secret Service. Under these budgetary conditions, the Secret Service will need to cut their equipment purchases significantly, reduce its agent force by approximately 200 agents, delay security improvements at the Vice President's residence and agent training related to special events air security.
- × **Cuts in IRS Customer Service at Tax Time:** The Internal Revenue Service would be forced to operate roughly \$140 million below the level needed to maintain current operations if a six-month CR is passed, forcing severe cuts in staff and harming the IRS' efforts to improve customer services. Last year, taxpayers used various IRS services – including 24-hour telephone service and walk-in sites – more than 50 million times through the end of March. Operating on last year's funding level would mean massive reductions in service during the tax filing season or reduced customer service efforts, such as fewer taxpayer phone calls answered.
- × **Threatening Enforcement of Workplace Safety:** A six-month continuing resolution would lead to an immediate hiring freeze through the Department of Labor. Even with the freeze, three DOL agencies may have to furlough up to 4,200 employees from 2 to 15 days, which would have an adverse impact on America's workers in all of the Labor Department's programs, from job training to enforcement of workplace safety laws. In addition, the failure to pass a budget would delay the Department's work to replace and/or upgrade the network technology infrastructure, hindering critical cyber security efforts.

Rolling Stone Interview/ Drugs
December 7, 2000

Q: Is the President suggesting that the Administration now supports efforts to de-criminalize marijuana?

A: The Administration does not support the de-criminalization of marijuana. The President's major point is that we need to look seriously at our policies of imprisonment and mandatory minimum sentences for nonviolent minor offenses and look at other alternatives such as drug courts and treatment programs.

Q: Was the President correct in stating that "small amounts of marijuana have been de-criminalized in most places"?

A: Some states have de-criminalized the possession of small amounts of marijuana. Law enforcement in most jurisdictions treats the possession of small amounts of marijuana by first-time offenders differently than more serious offenses, and many prosecutors exercise their discretion in the disposition of minor marijuana possession offenses.

Q: [Note: only address this question if asked.] Aren't the President's comments about de-criminalizing marijuana inconsistent with the Administration's position opposing the use of medical marijuana?

A: First of all, the President's main point in talking about the decriminalization of low-level marijuana offenses is that we cannot jail our way out of the drug problem. He believes that we shouldn't have harsh sentences for first-time, non-violent offenders, and that we can get tough on drug use by getting tough on drug treatment, which is something this Administration has supported. Moreover, the President believes that we should try to rationalize our drug sentencing structure, such as in crack and powder cocaine sentencing.

As for marijuana, we oppose its legalization for medical purposes. Under the federal drug laws, marijuana is classified as a "schedule I" controlled substance, meaning that it has no currently accepted medical use and a high potential for abuse. The Administration has opposed local and state ballot initiatives seeking to override federal law by making marijuana medically available. If marijuana is to be re-classified under the federal drug laws, it must go through the appropriate FDA scientific procedures, and we encourage that research to go forward.

Q: What have you done to try and change the disparities between crack and powder cocaine?

A: As the President said, the Administration supports a reduction in the disparity between crack and powder cocaine sentences in the federal system. In 1997, on the recommendation of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, the Administration announced its support for a revision to current federal sentences to shrink the disparity for crack and powder cocaine trafficking from

100:1 to 10:1. Our position would focus prosecutorial resources on mid-and upper level crack dealers instead of low-level offenders, and would impose tougher sentences on high level powder cocaine traffickers. We also believe this change to the currently inequitable sentencing scheme for crack and powder cocaine is important as a matter of overall fairness. Unfortunately, the Republican-led Congress refused to embrace our proposal and tried to pass legislation, unsuccessfully, that would only raise penalties for powder cocaine traffickers.

Q: What has the Administration done in terms of drug treatment for nonviolent offenders?

A: This Administration has made drug testing and treatment for drug offenders a top priority in the effort to break the cycle of crime and drugs. One of our major accomplishments in this area is the Administration's drug court initiative contained in the historic 1994 Crime Bill. Drug courts have been shown to reduce future drug use and recidivism in offenders who participate. Through the drug court initiative, we have helped to expand the number of drug courts providing extensive judicial supervision and treatment for first-time, non-violent offenders from a dozen in 1994 to well over 400 drug courts across the country today. The Administration has also increased the number of federal inmates receiving substance abuse treatment from 1,135 in 1992 to 10,816 in 1999. In addition, we passed legislation to require states to develop comprehensive drug testing and treatment plans for their prisoners and parolees. Finally, we have repeatedly fought for more resources for states to provide drug treatment for offenders, although the Republican Congress has not been receptive to providing these funds.

Q: The President also said that 90% of the people who are in prison will eventually be let out. What are you doing to address the many needs that released offenders have in order to maximize the chance that they will be productive, as the President said in the interview?

A: Approximately 95 percent of prisoners will eventually be released from incarceration. Moreover, an unprecedented number of prison releases are anticipated in the coming years. The latest estimates are that in 1999, over half a million offenders were released from state and federal prisons and returned to their communities. In addition to the efforts we've made to provide more drug treatment for offenders as mentioned above, we have also proposed a new \$145 million Reentry Initiative in the FY 01 budget to focus on providing critical services to released prisoners to help keep them on the right track and out of trouble. Among other things, the funding would be used to fund reentry partnerships and reentry courts to provide community supervision of offenders returning to communities, job training to reintegrate ex-offenders into the mainstream community, more funding for substance abuse and mental health services, and efforts to foster responsible parenting.

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP: ENDANGERING THE BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT ON THE BUDGET, JEOPARDIZING IMPORTANT INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION AND OTHER PRIORITIES

In November, the Clinton-Gore Administration reached consensus with congressional representatives on next year's appropriations bill for the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Education. The agreement included the largest one-year increase in education ever. However, this landmark achievement is now in jeopardy because majority leadership backed away from the agreement and may postpone legislation until next year.

KEY EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND LABOR PROGRAMS	FREEZE AT FY 2000 LEVEL	BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT	DIFFERENCE	IMPACT OF JEOPARDIZED RESOURCES
EDUCATION				
Class-Size Reduction in Early Grades: Third installment in the bipartisan commitment to help school districts hire and train 100,000 new teachers over 7 years to reduce class sizes in the early grades to an average of 18 students per class.	\$1.3 billion	\$1.75 billion	- \$450 million	Would prevent school districts from hiring approximately 12,000 new teachers to reduce classes in the early grades, denying about 648,000 children the benefits of smaller classes.
Urgent School Renovation: Provides support for short-term emergency repairs, such as repair of roofs, plumbing and electrical systems and meeting fire and safety codes.	\$0	\$1 billion	- \$1 billion	Would deny schools \$1 billion to help them make urgently needed building repairs and renovations.
Title I Accountability Fund: Strengthens accountability by accelerating State and local efforts to turn around the lowest performing Title I schools.	\$134 million	\$250 million	- \$116 million	Over 2,300 low-performing and failing schools would not get extra federal assistance to improve their academic performance.
Title I Grants to LEAs (excluding Accountability Fund): Helps disadvantaged students learn the basics and achieve to high standards.	\$7.807 billion	\$8.447 billion	- \$639 million	Would reduce or eliminate services to over 900,000 educationally disadvantaged students aimed at helping them reach the same high State standards expected of all children.
After-School: Offers families a safe place for their children to learn during the after-school and summertime hours.	\$453 million	\$1.026 billion	- \$573 million	Approximately 850,000 children would not get extended learning opportunities in after-school centers. This figure excludes children served by earmarked projects.
Eisenhower State Grants for Teacher Professional Development: Provides formula grants to States and school districts to help teachers improve their skills in core academic subjects.	\$335 million	\$585 million	- \$250 million	Nearly 15,000 school districts would not get \$250 million in additional Federal help to reduce the number of uncertified teachers and teachers who are not trained in the subjects they are teaching. Would deny participation to as many as 1.2 million teachers.
Eisenhower National Activities for Teacher Professional Development: Provide direct support, on a competitive basis, to projects that improve teacher quality.	\$38 million	\$82 million	- \$44 million	Would prevent support of important new initiatives to train early childhood educators and to help recruit talented mid-career professionals and college graduates into teaching.
Special Education: Helps States provide high-quality special education and related services to children with disabilities aged birth through 21 years.	\$6.0 billion	\$7.7 billion	- \$1.7 billion	Would deny valuable assistance to States in carrying out their responsibility to provide equal education opportunities to over 6 million children with disabilities. The Federal share of special education costs would drop from 15 percent to 12 percent. The \$1.6 billion does not include an additional \$300 million increase for special education or technology.

KEY EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND LABOR PROGRAMS	FREEZE AT FY 2000 LEVEL	BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT	DIFFERENCE	IMPACT OF JEOPARDIZED RESOURCES
Education Technology: Closes the digital divide by increasing access to computers and the Internet, and helps teachers effectively use technology in the classroom.	\$766 million	\$895 million	-\$130 million	Denies funding to approximately 480 new Community Technology Centers in 190 low-income rural and urban communities, and fails to provide more funds for Teacher Training in Technology.
Small, Safe, and Successful High Schools: Provides support for high schools to create smaller learning communities like schools-within-schools and career academies.	\$45 million	\$125 million	-\$80 million	Would deny as many as 650 high schools support to establish smaller learning communities of no more than 600 students.
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations: Helps schools implement comprehensive school reforms that are based on reliable research and effective practices.	\$220 million	\$260 million	-\$40 million	Would deny 541 additional schools the opportunity to carry out research-based reforms.
Safe and Drug Free Schools National Activities: Supports efforts to prevent youth violence and drug use.	\$111 million	\$155 million	-\$44 million	Would prevent additional support for the interagency Safe Schools/ Healthy Students program and funding to initiate Project School Emergency Response to Violence (SERV) to support schools and communities that suffer violent deaths or other traumatic crises.
Reading Excellence Act: Helps children learn to read well and independently by the end of the third grade.	\$260 million	\$286 million	-\$26 million	Would deny funding for services to help 100,000 children become successful readers.
Adult Education English Literacy/Civics Initiative: Provides English instruction, coupled with civics education, to recent immigrants and other LEP adults who lack the literacy skills necessary to effectively navigate U.S. public institutions and become full participants in the American economy	\$25.5 million	\$70 million	-\$44.5 million	Would deny critical English language and civics education services to nearly 150,000 additional immigrants and other LEP adults.
Vocational Education: Helps prepare students for their transition from school to occupation and lifelong learning in a technologically advanced society. Funds programs on the secondary and postsecondary level.	\$1.19 billion	\$1.24 billion	-\$50.3 million	Would cut significant funding for the integration of academic, vocational, and technical instruction, and the implementation of State standards and accountability systems.
Bilingual Education: Assists school districts in teaching English to limited English proficient (LEP) students and in helping these students meet the same challenging State standards required of all other students.	\$248 million	\$296 million	-\$48 million	Would deny the training and certification of over 5,600 additional bilingual education and English as a second language (ESL) teachers qualified to teach limited English proficient (LEP) students and would preclude funding for over 100 additional Instructional Services projects.
GEAR UP: Gives disadvantaged students and their families pathways to college through partnerships of middle and high schools, colleges and universities and through State- administered programs.	\$200 million	\$325 million	-\$125 million	Would deny approximately 600,000 low-income middle and high school students the tutoring, counseling, and mentoring they need to prepare for college. The Department of Education would be unable to fully fund continuation grants.

KEY EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND LABOR PROGRAMS	FREEZE AT FY 2000 LEVEL	BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT	DIFFERENCE	IMPACT OF JEOPARDIZED RESOURCES
TRIO: Funds college outreach and student support services for disadvantaged individuals to help them enter and complete postsecondary education programs.	\$645 million	\$760 million	- \$115 million	Would deny TRIO the largest funding increase in its history. Projects would not be able to increase intensity of services, make technology improvements, or serve up to 75,000 additional disadvantaged students. Would also prevent the establishment of College Completion Challenge Grants, which would provide 17,500 needy college students with additional grant aid to help them stay in college.
Pell Grants: Provides scholarships to low-income undergraduate students.	\$7.6 billion Max Grant: \$3300	\$9.0 billion Max Grant: \$3800	- \$1.4 billion Max Grant: -\$500	Nearly 4 million needy college students receive Pell Grants. In general, Pell Grants for full-time students would be reduced by \$500.
SEOG: Provides grant assistance to low-income undergraduate students.	\$631 million	\$691 million	- \$60 million	Over 100,000 additional needy undergraduates would not receive supplemental grant aid for college.
Work-Study: Helps undergraduate and graduate students pay for college through part-time work assistance.	\$934 million	\$1.011 billion	- \$77 million	Nearly 80,000 additional students would not receive work assistance, and the President's pledge to serve one million students would not be met.
Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Supports colleges with large Latino populations.	\$42 million	\$69 million	- \$27 million	More than 70 institutions would not receive new grants to increase their capacity to serve Latino students.
Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Grants help ensure equal opportunity and quality academic programs.	\$149 million	\$185 million	- \$36 million	The average grant to HBCUs would be reduced by \$370,000.
Tribal Colleges and Universities: Supports institutions that serve Native Americans.	\$6 million	\$15 million	- \$9 million	24 fewer colleges would receive needed assistance to improve their ability to serve Native American students.
Learning Anytime, Anywhere Partnerships: Helps provide access to college for underserved populations through technology.	\$23 million	\$30 million	- \$7 million	Less funding would be available for projects to improve technology-based learning opportunities.
Child Care Access Means Parents in Schools: Provides campus-based child care for low-income parents attending college.	\$5 million	\$25 million	- \$20 million	Approximately 300 colleges would be denied grants to establish or expand child care programs.
Research, Statistics, and Assessment: Provides support for education research, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP).	\$277 million	\$304 million	- \$27 million	Would jeopardize existing studies and surveys as well as cancel plans for the Language Minority Initiative and several NCES activities, including the Birth Cohort of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study and the Adult Literacy Study.

KEY EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND LABOR PROGRAMS	FREEZE AT FY 2000 LEVEL	BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT	DIFFERENCE	IMPACT OF JEOPARDIZED RESOURCES
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES				
<u>Head Start:</u> Prepares low-income children for a lifetime of learning by providing early, continuous and comprehensive child development and family support services.	\$5.3 billion	\$6.3 billion	-\$1 billion	Approximately 70,000 fewer students would participate in Head Start and be prepared for a lifetime of learning.
<u>Child Care for Low-Income Families:</u> The Child Care and Development Block Grant helps families pay for child care, thereby enabling low-income parents to work.	\$1.2 billion	\$2.0 billion	-\$817 million	Approximately 150,000 fewer children from low-income families would receive child care.
<u>Medical Research:</u> The National Institutes of Health funds biomedical research, the Human Genome Project, and other vital health research.	\$17.8 billion	\$20.5 billion	-\$2.7 billion	Would slow the pace of cutting edge research.
<u>Family Caregiver Program:</u> Part of the President's long-term care initiative; authorized under the Older American's Act	\$0	\$125 million	-\$125 million	Would prevent the implementation of a state program to provide assistance, such as respite care and training, to 250,000 families who care for their elderly relatives
<u>Increasing Healthcare Access:</u> The Community Access Program (CAP) grants assist in integrating primary healthcare services for underserved people.	\$25 million	\$125 million	-\$100 million	Would prevent over 50 approved sites on the waiting list, and those who would apply this year, from implementing programs to integrate their healthcare service delivery systems, streamline patient care, and increase health care access.
<u>Community Health Centers:</u> Provide primary care for uninsured and underserved populations.	\$1.02 billion	\$1.17 billion	-\$150 million	Would deny the network of 750 community health centers—which would serve over 9 million patients—\$150 million to expand services and provide patient care.
<u>Nursing Home Quality:</u> Funds oversight and enforcement of quality standards in nursing homes and other facilities.	\$210 million	\$244 million	-\$34 million	Would threaten the Administration's efforts to ensure the quality and safety of the nation's 1.6 million nursing home residents by forcing states to scale back or eliminate facility inspections, complaint investigations, and other quality enforcement efforts.
<u>Children's Graduate Medical Education:</u> Program to fill gap in medical education funds for children's hospitals.	\$40 million	\$285 million	-\$245 million	Would significantly restrict funding needed for free-standing children's hospitals to train physicians who care for children.
<u>Preventing Disease:</u> The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC's) infectious disease programs help detect and control emerging infectious diseases.	\$198 million	\$266 million	-\$68 million	Would stall efforts to combat diseases like West Nile Encephalitis.
<u>Domestic and Global HIV Prevention:</u> CDC supports state and local surveillance and prevention efforts to reduce the spread of HIV in the U.S.; internationally, CDC supports surveillance, prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections.	\$735 million	\$916 million	-\$186 million	Would hamper efforts to reduce the numbers of new HIV infections in the United States, particularly among high risk populations; . Would significantly limit our contribution to the UN AIDS Goal of reducing the spread of HIV among 15-to-25-year-olds by 25 percent by 2005 in sub-Saharan Africa.
<u>Ryan White:</u> Provides treatment and other services, including prescription drugs for Americans living with HIV/AIDS.	\$1.6 billion	\$1.8 billion	-\$229 million	Would prevent approximately 70,000 individuals from receiving HIV/AIDS treatment services and prevent the implementation of Ryan White Reauthorization.

KEY EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND LABOR PROGRAMS	FREEZE AT FY 2000 LEVEL	BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT	DIFFERENCE	IMPACT OF JEOPARDIZED RESOURCES
<u>Mental Health Services</u> : Provides services for the chronically mentally ill as well as prevention programs.	\$631 million	\$789 million	-\$158 million	Would shelve a new \$30 million program to help prevent serious mental illness and significantly cut \$64 million from states for mental health services.
<u>Bioterrorism</u> : Prepares our response to a biological terrorist attack.	\$232 million	\$283 million	-\$51 million	Would slow efforts to build a public health surveillance system and respond to bioterrorist attacks.
<u>Family Planning Clinics</u> : Helps fund reproductive health services and clinical care.	\$239 million	\$274 million	-\$35 million	Would deny a request to allow over 5 million low-income women to receive services. Annually clinics prevent over a million unintended pregnancies through reproductive health services through programs to discourage adolescent sexual activity, and contraceptive counseling and services.
LABOR				
<u>Dislocated Workers Assistance</u> : Continues the Universal Reemployment effort to give employment and training assistance to every dislocated worker who needs it.	\$1.59 billion	\$1.65 billion	-\$65 million	Over 80,000 participants will not receive training and employment services needed to become re-employed, earning wages comparable to their previous jobs.
<u>One-Stop Career Centers</u> : Ensures that One-Stop services are universally available either in person or electronically.	\$130 million	\$174 million	-\$44 million	Would deny improved access to One-Stop services for millions of Americans. The increased funding provides improvements in America's Job Bank, mobile vans for one-stop access to rural areas, a toll-free telephone number for the workforce investment system, and improvements in basic labor market information.
<u>Reemployment Services Grants</u> : Expands and improves employment services for individuals receiving unemployment compensation assistance.	\$0	\$50 million	-\$50 million	Would deny needed assistance to 222,000 unemployed insurance claimants to speed their reentry into the workforce.
<u>Youth Activities</u> : Provides summer jobs and year-round youth training activities to develop pathways for career opportunities.	\$1.0 billion	\$1.1 billion	-\$124 million	Would deny approximately 74,000 youth the multitude of services provided through summer jobs or year round training programs that ensure that youth are either employed, in advanced training, post-secondary education, military service or apprenticeships.
<u>Youth Opportunity Grants</u> : Addresses special problems of out-of-school youth, especially in inner cities and other areas with high jobless rates.	\$250 million	\$300 million	-\$50 million	Would deny training services to over 10,000 youth living in urban and rural areas, where the need for employment efforts is the greatest.
<u>Responsible Reintegration for Young Offenders</u> : A new initiative that will link offenders under age 35 with essential services that can help make the difference in their choices in the future.	\$0 million	\$65 million	-\$65 million	Would deny over 16,000 young ex-offenders essential services that can help make the difference in choices such as education, training, job placement, drug counseling and mentoring necessary to reintegrate them into the mainstream economy and decrease their recidivism rates.
<u>International Labor Activities</u> : Affirms the Administration's commitment to improving labor standards for all workers at-home and abroad.	\$70 million	\$153 million	-\$83 million	Would deny several critical international labor activities including initiatives to help eliminate abusive child labor by expanding access to basic education.
<u>Worker Protection</u> : Enforces federal safety, health, pensions, wages, and nondiscrimination protections.	\$1.1 billion	\$1.2 billion	-\$102 million	Would eliminate approximately 1,500 inspections to ensure safe and healthful workplaces.

[Automated Records Management System Hex-Dump Conversion]

Announcement of Forest Legacy Projects

- The following is a list of Forest Legacy projects that Secretary Glickman has proposed for Title VIII funding that is subject to Congressional approval:

Papa Parcel (Hawaii)	\$1,700,000
Gnaw Bone Camp (Indiana)	2,100,000
West Branch Project Phase II (Maine)	10,450,000
Thompson/Fisher Phase II (Montana)	2,520,000
Town Creek Phase II (North Carolina)	2,250,000
Karst Initiative/Rio Encantato (Puerto Rico)	600,000
Coastal Forest Ecosystem Restoration (South Carolina)	5,000,000
North Chickamauga Creek (Tennessee)	1,500,000
Range Creek (Utah)	300,000
Summit Park (Utah)	780,000
Issaquah Creek Headwaters II (Washington)	2,800,000
	\$ 30,000,000

- Forest Legacy is a key part of the Clinton-Gore Administration's Lands Legacy Initiative. The Administration recognizes the importance of promoting livability and combating development and successfully sought a doubling of funding for Forest Legacy this fiscal year.
- Information on \$30 million worth of Title II Forest Legacy projects, which do not require Congressional approval, will still be sent to Congress under separate cover.
- Through the acquisitions of land or interests in land, the Forest Legacy program is designed to conserve environmentally important forests threatened by conversion to non-forest uses. With Forest Legacy funds, the Forest Service works with states and willing private forest landowners to conserve the public benefits that forest cover generates. Working cooperatively, we use Forest Legacy funds to support projects that make communities more livable, protect water quality, sustain timber supplies, and improve wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities.
- The Forest Service, in consultation with participating states, developed the Title II and Title VIII lists based on priorities identified in approved Assessments of Need. Preference was given to projects that compliment federal lands and federal investments.
- The program is administered through state forestry departments and is funded by USDA's Forest Service. It helps identify and protect environmentally important, privately owned forestland that is threatened with conversion to non-forest uses by helping participating states acquire conservation easements, or development rights, from willing landowners. Conservation easements ensure that forestland will be protected for future generations but allow ownership of the lands to remain in private hands.

- The 23 states participating in the Forest Legacy Program will be eligible for project funding for the current fiscal year. The list of projects announced today includes projects in California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. See the attached project list for more details.
- The Forest Legacy Program was established in the 1990 Farm Bill and was originally restricted to the New England states and Washington State.

Susan McAvoy (202) 720-4623
susan.mcavoy@usda.gov
Keven Kennedy (202) 720-7173
keven.kennedy@usda.gov

GLICKMAN ANNOUNCES PLANS TO PROTECT 750,000 ACRES OF PRIVATE FOREST LAND FROM DEVELOPMENT

WASHINGTON, December 6, 2000 -- Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman today announced that USDA plans to protect nearly 750,000 acres of environmentally important private forest land nationwide from being developed for commercial, residential, or other non-forest uses.

“This relatively small public investment will help protect for future generations 750,000 acres of precious private forest land from the threat of urban sprawl and other development pressures,” said Glickman.

The \$60 million Forest Legacy Program, administered by USDA’s Forest Service, helps participating states acquire forest lands or conservation easements from willing landowners. Conservation easements enable the government to purchase development rights that protect forest lands but also allow ownership of the lands to remain in private hands. Projects funded under the program must include a non-federal match of at least 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

The Forest Legacy Program is part of the broader Clinton-Gore Administration’s Land’s Legacy Initiative. The Administration recognizes the importance of protecting important forest resources and successfully sought a doubling of funding for this important program this fiscal year.

While some are subject to Congressional approval, the projects include --

- \$12,450,000 to conserve forest land in Maine’s North Woods, including one of the largest contiguous blocks of land under single management in the eastern U.S.
- \$1,722,000 to purchase land and conservation easements in New York State, including land in the Sterling Forest, 40 miles northwest of New York City.
- \$1,000,000 for a conservation easement to help protect 2,056 acres of forested land and adjacent marshes and wetlands in King William County, Virginia. There are nesting bald eagles on this property. The Mattaponi Tribe want to re-establish ownership and cultural traditions on this land.
- \$3,730,000 for conservation easements to help protect over 500 acres of open space and riparian areas in King County, Washington, including land along the I-90 corridor

between Seattle and the Cascade Mountains.

- \$830,000 to preserve 900 acres of prime mixed evergreen forest land and open space around Volcan Mountain in San Diego, California.
- \$4,151,000 for a conservation easement to protect 5,565 acres of forest at Great Mountain, Connecticut, including habitat for rare and endangered species. The tract lies within viewshed of the Appalachian Trail.
- \$1,000,000 to purchase a conservation easement on one of the largest contiguous blocks of land in Massachusetts' Taconic Range.
- \$1,950,000 to purchase a conservation easement on 2,805 acres in Summit County, Utah to protect elk, deer, moose, and bear. The landowner donated \$625,000 in easement value.

USDA also announced projects in Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, and Wisconsin. A complete list of the projects, with detailed information on each one, is available on the web at www.usda.gov.

#

Natural Gas & Heating Oil
December 7, 2000

Q. Natural Gas or Heating Oil Prices and Supplies:

- We recognize that natural gas stocks are lower than normal, and that prices will be higher than in the past, largely as a result of increased demand due to cold weather.
- Despite lower than average stocks, we believe that there will be sufficient supplies to get through the winter.
- In fact, Secretary Richardson met with a broad range of industry representatives just two weeks ago, and they assured him that they have adequate supplies to meet firm customer needs.
- We also realize that heating oil stocks are lower than normal, but likewise believe there will be sufficient supplies to get through the winter.
- In the event of a severe heating oil shortage, we have the 2 million barrel heating oil reserve in the Northeast.
- We also expect that higher prices will keep refineries producing as much heating oil as possible.
- The Department of Energy also is working with other agencies (Coast Guard, Transportation, and EPA) to reduce the potential for bottlenecks in the transportation and distribution network for heating oil so that consumers can continue to receive important fuel deliveries.
- To help all consumers, we have also put out a record \$400 million in LIHEAP funds (in September), and will have more after Congress passes the Labor HHS appropriation.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

December 6, 2000

STATEMENT BY TREASURY SECRETARY LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS

We welcome the announcement by the Turkish authorities and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) of a strengthened reform program.

We look forward to strong and immediate implementation by the Turkish authorities of the steps vital for the restoration of confidence and financial stability.

Turkey's financial stability is important to the United States.

-30-

LS - 1064

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

December 7, 2000

EUROPE/SEE

Northern Ireland/Killings in North

Belfast (new)

**Northern Ireland/POTUS Trip
(updated)**

Northern Ireland/Real IRA

Romanian Elections (new)

NATO (new)

US-EU/Beef and Bananas (new)

RUSSIA/NIS

Russia/Cohen-Sergeyev on Aide

Memoire (draft/new)

Russia/Pope Trial (updated)

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

MEPP

Iraq/Oil

TRANSNATIONAL

**Yemen/Cole Investigation
(updated)**

Afghanistan/Taliban

Protecting Cyber Networks

ASIA/INTECON

Burma

North Korea

INTERAM

Peru/Shining Path (new)

**Venezuela/Chavez on Bolivia and
Ecuador (new)**

AFRICA

Liberia (new)

Ethiopia-Eritrea Peace Accord

MULTILATERAL

ICC Negotiations (draft/new)

DEFENSE

Don't Ask, Don't Tell (new)

NORTHERN IRELAND: KILLINGS IN NORTH BELFAST
December 7, 2000

CONTEXT: Two people have been killed and one wounded in North Belfast in the last day and a half. A local RUC officer called yesterday's killing of Gary Moore, a 30-year old Catholic father of two from Limavady, "a naked sectarian murder carried out by loyalist paramilitaries." Another Catholic, Paul Sullion was shot yesterday and is in critical condition. These shootings came in the wake of the murder of Protestant taxi driver Trevor Kell on Tuesday in a shooting some believe is linked to drugs. The Real IRA has issued a statement denying involvement in that killing. Irish Foreign Minister Brian Cowen has called on all those with influence in their community to use their utmost efforts to ensure calm. David Trimble has said the violence is a reminder that the problem is not just one-sided (republican) and that all paramilitaries need to "close up shop." The risk of more tit-for-tat killings complicates prospects for reaching agreement between the parties on steps to put paramilitary arms beyond use -- indeed, that may be one aim of the killings.

Points to Make

- Condemn the shootings in North Belfast over past two days. Extend our condolences to families of those killed and injured.
- On the eve of the President's visit aimed at supporting efforts by the parties to overcome the latest impasse in the peace process, this violence reminds us of what is at stake.
- Join with political leaders in calling for calm, urge people of Northern Ireland to focus attention on restoring momentum toward full implementation of all aspects of the Good Friday Accord.

[If pressed]: Doesn't this just show that you need to press harder for decommissioning?]

- Clearly putting paramilitary weapons beyond use is a key issue in GFA implementation, and we urge the governments and the parties to work together to achieve this goal -- all parties have a role to play in that process.

NORTHERN IRELAND: POTUS TRIP
December 6, 2000

CONTEXT: Over the weekend, UUP leader David Trimble made public statements putting the burden on President Clinton to resolve the decommissioning issue and break the current impasse in the peace process. Senator Mitchell has told British TV that the parties bear primary responsibility for resolving the dispute, and that the President's role is to provide a boost to their efforts. The President's visit in fact serves as a deadline, a forcing event, prompting the parties to reach agreement in circumstances where they might otherwise delay indefinitely.

Points to Make

- President Clinton will use his visit to encourage the political leaders and people to move the process forward; he wants to be helpful in any way he can.
- He recognizes the U.S. role is a limited one -- the primary responsibility, as Senator Mitchell said over the weekend, belongs to the government and the people there.

[If pressed]: Do you agree with Trimble that it is up to the President to resolve decommissioning?

- It is the parties and governments themselves that bear primary responsibility for implementing all aspects of the Good Friday Accord, and the President hopes his visit will support those efforts.

IRA Statement

Do you have a reaction to Tuesday's IRA statement?

- We note that the statement reiterates the IRA's commitment to the peace process and to putting its arms beyond use.

- We support the efforts of the governments and the parties to advance this process.
- The President is going to Ireland and Northern Ireland not to negotiate a resolution, but to remind the parties of how far they've come, what remains at stake and that they have to find a way to fully implement the Good Friday Accord. It is ultimately up to them to work through these issues, reach a common understanding and continue to build on the progress that has been made.

Gary McMichael Meeting with POTUS

BBC reports UDP leader Gary McMichael as being disappointed the President will not meet with his party at Stormont [since it did not win seats in the Assembly] -- what is your reaction?

- Details of the President's schedule are still being worked out. The President has high regard for Gary McMichael's ongoing contribution to the peace process.

NORTHERN IRELAND: REAL IRA
November 28, 2000

CONTEXT: PM's Blair and Ahern have received from RUC chief Ronnie Flanagan and Garda chief Pat Byrne a joint recommendation that on balance it would make operational sense to have RIRA "designated" a "foreign terrorist organization" under the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996. The governments issued a statement today (in order not to appear to be reacting to anticipated leaks) indicating they have decided to jointly request the USG to "set in motion the relevant procedures in relation to designation." State (S/CT) believes evidence they have (routinely) compiled on RIRA provides a basis for moving toward designation, although it could take some weeks to build the file up to the degree necessary to withstand likely legal challenges. In addition, State and we need to assess the domestic impact on possible RIRA supporters, to ensure that the net effect of designation would not be counter-productive.

Points to Make

- We share HMG and GOI concerns about the activities of the Real IRA. U.S. law enforcement aggressively targets efforts by any group to undermine the peace process through illegal activities in the U.S.
- We welcome the considered recommendations of the two governments, and will factor these into our ongoing assessment of how best to thwart the activities of the Real IRA. which is already treated at a terrorist organization by the USG.
- The designation process is coordinated by the Department of State, and I would refer you there for further comment.

What can you tell us about the Gilman letter to the President requesting certification of funding for Northern Ireland police force?

- Question is premature. Policing legislation was only just passed last week. Still awaiting implementation plan and other possible tweaks. Until then,

impossible to pass judgment on legislation, which, in any event, is really for the parties to do.

- In any case, the law calls on POTUS to certify that the governments have implemented Patten, not to "certify" that they haven't -- in other words, there is no obligation to certify anything unless we feel it is appropriate to do so (and for reasons above, we don't yet feel it is).

ROMANIA: ELECTIONS
December 6, 2000

BACKGROUND: On Sunday, December 10, Romania will hold its second round of presidential elections. The leading contenders emerging from the first round are Ion Iliescu (36.4 %), a leftist socialist, and Corneliu Tudor (28 %), an extreme nationalist. At least one poll last week suggested the second round would be close. Another poll published Monday, December 4, puts Iliescu at 61 percent and Tudor at 39 percent. While an Iliescu presidency would likely result in slower reform and Western integration, a Tudor presidency would pose far more serious problems. Tudor is openly anti-semitic and anti-Hungarian (there is a large Hungarian minority in Romania).

Any comment on the Romanian election results?

- Support the democratic process in Romania and look forward to seeing the results of the final round on December 10.
- Wish to have an effective and strong partnership with the future Romanian President and Government. Our ability to do so will depend on the degree to which Romania's leadership continues to demonstrate its commitment to common European and Euro-Atlantic standards of democracy, respect for rule of law and human rights, including the rights of minorities.

What about the strong vote for Tudor? Does this signify the emergence of fascism in Romania?

- No comment on individual candidates.

NATO/EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY
December 7, 2000

Secretary Cohen told his Allied counterparts this week that EU efforts to develop an EU rapid reaction force could make NATO “a relic”. Does the U.S. oppose this rapid reaction force?

- President has said from beginning he supports efforts by Europeans to assume more responsibility for their own security, including by improving military capabilities and creating an EU rapid reaction force that could act in crises where NATO decides not to engage.
- EU has made clear it wants to build capabilities that will complement and strengthen NATO, not replace it. We are working closely with European allies to ensure necessary coordination, including on joint force planning.

U.S.-EU: BEEF AND BANANAS
December 7, 2000

Will the president and PM Blair discuss U.S.-EU trade disputes including beef, bananas and the FSC matter?

- As in past meetings between the President and PM Blair, Beef and bananas may be discussed. The U.S.-EU summit will take place in Washington on December 18, and our negotiators are still working to see if we can resolve one or both of those two longstanding disputes. It is too soon to tell whether we will succeed by the 18th. The president and Prime Minister Blair have both expressed a strong interest in resolving those cases to our mutual satisfaction as soon as possible.
- As for FSC, U.S.-EU discussions are taking place at the WTO, according to the bilateral agreement on procedures we reached in September.

Last Friday, an official from the EC expressly stated that the EU would immediately move to impose retaliation if the U.S. issues the "carousel" list. This implies a link between the two cases. What is your response?

- The United States does not link these two disputes. Each case is considered individually and on its own merits. With respect to the carousel issue, we have made some progress on these disputes recently and while that is not to say that a solution is imminent, we do not believe it is productive to issue a carousel retaliation list while we are making forward motion. Our goal remains to resolve the underlying disputes and to manage these issues in a responsible manner.

DRAFT

RUSSIA: COHEN-SERGEYEV ON AIDE MEMOIRE

December 7, 2000

- The United States does not accept Russia's unilateral withdrawal from the understanding on conventional arms transfers signed by the Russian Prime Minister in 1995. In light of this reversal in policy, we should be wary of Moscow's latest pledge.
- It should also be noted that, by taking this unilateral action, Russia is breaking with the other members of the Wassenaar Arrangement and placing itself in a category of one.

RUSSIA: POPE VERDICT
December 7, 2000

Any reaction to yesterday's guilty verdict and 20 year sentence in espionage trial of Edmund Pope?

- The verdict in Pope trial in Moscow is unjustifiable and flat-out wrong.
- No evidence that Mr. Pope violated any Russian law.
- Deeply concerned by news from Mrs. Pope who is in Moscow that his health has deteriorated in recent days.
- Urge Russian authorities at highest levels to act immediately to release Mr. Pope on humanitarian grounds, allow him to be reunited with his loved ones in the U.S., and to receive appropriate medical care.
- Our Embassy will work closely with Mr. Pope's family and legal team on next steps.

Do you expect Putin to grant clemency to Mr. Pope?

- As we've said, we've made clear to Russian government at highest levels that they should move to release Mr. Pope on humanitarian grounds.

Do you expect Pope's lawyers to file an appeal?

- Understand Pope's family and lawyers are consulting on next steps.

Is President Clinton going to call President Putin to make a personal plea?

- President will continue to do everything possible to secure Pope's release as early as possible.

In the discussions that the President has had, what has the reaction of President Putin been?

- I'm not going to discuss specific conversations between the two Presidents, but I will only say that the Russian government understands the importance that we attach to this case.

What does this verdict mean for U.S.-Russian relations?

- Believe Pope case has cast shadow over U.S.-Russian relations since Mr. Pope was arrested last April.
- President, Secretary Albright, others members of foreign policy team all working actively to help secure Mr. Pope's release.
- Have made clear to Russian authorities that Mr. Pope's health is quite fragile. Want to see Mr. Pope released on humanitarian grounds at earliest opportunity.

Are you prepared to cut off aid to Russia if Pope isn't released?

- Pope case very important factor in U.S.-Russian relations. Case is casting shadow over U.S.-Russian relations.
- Administration's decisions on assistance to Russia are based on our national interest in promoting emergence of stable, democratic Russia with market economy. We have core national interests at stake in Russia's transformation.
- Important to put our assistance programs in that context. Would point out that two-thirds of our assistance is aimed at reducing threat posed by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Remainder is focused largely at promoting grass-roots economic and democratic reform outside Moscow.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS
December 5, 2000

Anything new on the fact-finding committee?

- The committee completed its initial round of meetings last week and continues to move ahead with its work.
- . There remain a few questions that need to be resolved between the committee and the parties.

Have you overcome concerns that the Israelis have about the committee?

- Israeli government officials publicly stated their support for the committee. It is a major element of the Sharm agreement. We expect the committee to move ahead as quickly as possible.

Any next steps contemplated at this point?

- Nothing to announce.

The President talked with Barak last week. Any plans to talk with Arafat?

- We confer with the Palestinians at various levels all the time. When the President confers again with the Chairman, we'll let you know.

The President travels to Ireland next week. The holidays fall right afterwards. At what point do you think it's impossible to reach an agreement?

- The peace process belongs to the parties. What happens between now and the end of the Administration is up to them. We are willing to do whatever we can to help.

- We remain focused on breaking the cycle of violence so that the parties can focus on getting back to the peace process. We are prepared to do whatever we can to support them over the next seven weeks

IRAQ: OIL-FOR-FOOD ROLLOVER

December 6, 2000

What's your reaction to the UN resolution rolling over oil-for-food.

- The Council voted unanimously in favor of the resolution. This is another manifestation of Council consensus that the oil-for-food program remains the best means of addressing the legitimate humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people as long as the Iraqi regime continues to refuse to meet its obligations to the Security Council.

Won't it weaken the sanctions by allowing Iraq to use oil-for-food money to pay for domestic costs of its oil industry and its UN dues, as well as expanding the list of pre-approved contract categories to include housing and electricity?

- Hardly. We and our colleagues on the Council have regularly adjusted aspects of the oil-for-food program to ensure that it is working as efficiently as possible.
- In this case, the Council agreed that it would be useful to consider possibly adding housing and electricity contracts to the pre-approved list because these are important needs of the Iraqi people and these are categories in which dual-use concerns are fairly slight. The sanctions committee will review this request at an appropriate time.
- We agreed that once Iraq cooperates in implementing all of the various Security Council resolutions, it would be appropriate for the Council to consider the possibility of allowing Iraq to pay its UN dues from oil-for-funds.
- As far as allowing Iraq to use oil-for-food money to pay for domestic oil costs, the export of Iraqi oil is a key element of the oil-for-food program and the Security Council has taken similar actions in the past to ensure that Iraq can pump the oil necessary to meet its legitimate humanitarian needs.

YEMEN: COLE INVESTIGATION
December 7, 2000

Who is Abdulmajid Dahoumane? What do we know about him? Any connection to COLE?

- We are aware that Dahoumane is in Algerian custody. Law enforcement officials are in contact with the Algerian government. There is no information linking him to the COLE.

Governor Bush, after receiving his intelligence briefing, went out of his way to suggest that terrorists should not presume that the U.S. is distracted by this election contest. Is there intelligence to suggest that the U.S. faces an increased threat because of the fight over the Florida vote?

- We remain concerned about potential threats to U.S. interests in the Middle East and elsewhere. Some terrorists groups look at the Ramadan period as a particularly attractive time to conduct attacks. The increased security measures that were taken in Turkey and the Arabian Peninsula last month are still in effect.

A few days ago the press reported that Raed Mohamed Hassan Hajazi may be wanted for questioning in the COLE bombing? Will the U.S. seek extradition?

- Jordan has informed us of the arrest of Mr. Hajazi in connection with the 1999 terrorist plot in Amman. We are in consultations with Jordan about the arrest, in light of the threat to Americans in the 1999 plot and because Mr. Hajazi is an American citizen. We have no further information at this time.

Has the United States determined that Usama bin Laden was responsible in some way for the attack against the USS COLE?

- Our investigation with the Yemenis is on-going. Just yesterday, we signed a memorandum of understanding regarding joint cooperation. We are aggressively pursuing those responsible for the attack. There are suspects in

custody. But we have reached no conclusion at this point as to who was behind the attack.

Fair enough, but if you decide that Usama bin Laden was somehow responsible, are you prepared to order a military strike as was done in August 1998? Do you think that strike was effective?

- We have made clear that we will do everything that we can to bring those responsible for the COLE attack to justice. We will also do all that is necessary to prevent future threats to our people or our national interests.
- Since the East Africa bombings, we have been successful in preventing further attacks. We took military action in August 1998. We have improved our international cooperation. We have increased intelligence collection. We have aggressively tried to deny him the financial assets needed to fund his network. Diplomatically, we have sanctions in place to force the Taliban to give him up.
- If and when we determine both how the attack was carried out, who was involved and what kind of threat they continue to pose, we are prepared to act as necessary to protect our national interests. There are a range of options we could take. The use of military force is one of many options.

AFGHANISTAN: PROPOSED UN SANCTIONS
NOVEMBER 30, 2000

BACKGROUND: Original sanctions banned foreign flights by Afghanistan's national airline, Ariana, and froze Taliban assets abroad. These sanctions were carefully targeted to affect only the Taliban, not ordinary Afghans. Because of Taliban non-compliance with last year's UN resolution demanding that Bin Laden be expelled, we are discussing with the other Permanent Security Council members a new resolution which would strengthen the existing sanctions and add further measures. Among the measures under discussion are: (1) an arms embargo on the Taliban, (2) closure of Taliban offices outside of Afghanistan and reduction in size of Taliban diplomatic missions (which exist only in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the UAE), (3) ban on travel by high Taliban officials, (4) ban on all flights (humanitarian exceptions) to and from Afghanistan, (5) ban on export to Afghanistan of chemicals used in heroin production. These measures are carefully tailored to affect only the Taliban, not ordinary Afghans.

What can you tell us about the joint US-Russia UN Security Council resolution that would prohibit the sale of weapons to the Taliban?

- We expect the resolution will be formally introduced in the Security Council shortly and we will press for its passage soon thereafter.
- In October 1999 the Security Council unanimously passed resolution 1267 which called upon the Taliban to turn over Usama bin Laden to a country where he could be brought to justice. When the Taliban refused to comply, sanctions were imposed. One year later, the Taliban still have not complied.
- Resolution 1267 noted the Council's readiness to consider further measures if the Taliban did not comply. So the Council is now considering further action.

Won't these measures harm the Afghan people who are suffering greatly already?

- The current sanctions are carefully constructed not to harm the Afghan people. For instance, the flight ban allows exemptions for humanitarian and religious purposes. Ordinary trade continues via overland routes.
- We will work carefully with other members of the Council to ensure that any new measures adopted do not harm ordinary Afghans.
- I would note that the international community provides the aid which keeps Afghans alive. The U.S. is the largest donor to this effort, contributing over \$100 million this year.

[IF ASKED] Won't a one-sided arms embargo hurt only the Taliban and assist their opponents?

- The UN Security Council resolution currently in effect came about because of the Taliban's harboring of Usama bin Laden and their general support for terrorism. It is the Taliban who are giving shelter to Bin Laden, not their opponents. We would expect that any new resolution would also focus on Bin Laden and terrorism. It is therefore appropriate that any new measures adopted be against the Taliban.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S CYBER NETWORKS FROM CRIMINALS AND ATTACKS

December 6, 2000

The President takes concerns about protecting the Internet and fighting cyber-crime seriously. Since issuing PDD-63 almost two and one half years ago, the Clinton Administration has lead the nation in an aggressive national program to fight cyber-crime and protect cyber-systems from disruption.

Increased Federal resources for protecting the Internet: The Clinton Administration continues its aggressive support for protecting our critical cyber-networks through the budget process. Federal spending has more than doubled since 1998.

Contained in the \$2.03 billion budget proposal for FY 01 are several key initiatives:

- \$50 M for the creation of *the Institute for Information Infrastructure Protection*, a new institute funded through the Commerce Department, and designed to work collaboratively with both industry and government to fill the R&D gaps in cyber-protection technologies.
- \$25 M for the *Federal Cyber Services Initiative*, creating a Scholarship for Service Program to bring trained cyber-security specialists into Federal service, as well as programs to train and certify Federal systems administrators.
- \$10 M for the *Federal Intrusion Detection Network (FIDNet)*, a 'burglar alarm' to protect sensitive data contained in Federal computers.
- \$5 M for the *Expert Review Team*, a group of specialists assisting Federal agencies with improving their computer security.
- \$1 M to state and local governments to assist them in the creation of cyber-security centers to protect America's communities.

Action on many of these initiatives is still in the hands of Congress. As of today, only the Federal Cyber-Service has been partially funded for FY 2001.

A Comprehensive National Plan: In January the President released Version 1.0 of the National Plan for Information Systems Protection. The Plan describes a comprehensive set of actions by both the Federal government and state and private sector partners to protect our critical cyber-systems.

A National Threat, Warning and Response Center: Under President Clinton, the FBI, Justice Department, and other Federal law enforcement and national security agencies have created the National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC), a unique center that brings together the Federal resources necessary to prevent and investigate cyber crime and attacks. The NIPC works in close partnership with private industry and state and local law enforcement in building the national capabilities to eliminate cyber-crime.

A Strong Public-Private Partnership: With most cyber-networks owned and operated by the private sector, close partnership is important. In February, the President chaired the first-ever cyber-security summit with leaders of the Internet and IT industries. With encouragement from the White House, a number of key sectors, including banking and finance, telecommunications, electric power, and the IT industry, have created Computer Security Centers to provide support and assistance in preventing computer crimes and attacks.

BURMA: AUNG SAN SUU KYI/MEDAL OF FREEDOM
December 6, 2000

BACKGROUND: Aung San Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy won elections in 1990 whose results have never been recognized by the ruling military government. She has been under house arrest several times since 1990, and may not travel freely throughout Burma. She has resisted regime efforts to drive her into foreign exile.

Why is the President presenting the Medal of Freedom to ASSK?

- Aung San Suu Kyi is one of the world's most prominent figures in the struggle to advance democracy. Her unwavering commitment to securing a free Burma through nonviolent means is an inspiration to her countrymen and to people around the world.

What is the state of the United States relationship with the Burmese government?

- Because of its failure to recognize the results of the election in 1990 and because of its repression, the Government of Burma is under a range of U.S. economic sanctions, including a ban on new investments by U.S. persons. The United States is represented in Rangoon by a Charge d'Affaires.

What is the U.S. doing to help the plight of ASSK and the Burmese?

- The United States has employed a range of diplomatic and economic measures to pressure the Burmese regime to recognize the results of the 1990 election, to engage in a dialogue with legitimate Burmese political figures, and to respect and protect the human rights of all Burmese. The United States supports the efforts of the United Nations Secretary General to address political and human rights concerns in Burma.

NORTH KOREA
December 5, 2000

BACKGROUND: Congressman Tony Hall recently visited North Korea and reported food conditions were worsening. The food situation, which is always precarious in North Korea, worsened this year by the drought that affected the North's main crops of corn and rice. The food deficit unmet by North Korean production is estimated in the range of 1.2 million metric tons, a sizeable increase over last year's deficit. As a result of these projections, based on surveys conducted by U.N. agencies, the U.N. World Food Program announced this week a new appeal for North Korea for 2001. The appeal is for 810,070 metric tons, considerably larger than previous years.

What is the U.S. response to the World Food Program appeal to North Korea? Is it linked to a decision on whether the President will travel to North Korea?

- The U.S. will be considering how to respond to this new appeal.
- Since 1995, the U.S. has donated nearly 1.5 million tons of food for distribution in North Korea.
- Our response to this appeal is not related to a decision on a Presidential trip. Our policy has been to provide food assistance in response to international appeals to meet a demonstrated humanitarian need.

When will the President decide about the North Korea visit?

- He has not decided whether he will go to North Korea before the end of his term. We continue to review both the results of the Secretary's trip to Pyongyang and the missile talks in Malaysia.
- He will make his decision based on advancing our national security interests, not based on any arbitrary timeline – beyond of course the end of his term.

But are you still looking for something from the North Koreans so he can make a positive decision? Does President Kim support his trip?

- The discussions that the Secretary had in Pyongyang were very important. The follow on missile talks were constructive, but some important issues are unresolved and require further clarification. We also have other considerations besides missile issues as part of our efforts to reduce tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

Will you send another delegation to North Korea soon?

- Further U.S.-DPRK meetings are possible, but none are currently scheduled.

PERU: SHINING PATH LEADER CAPTURE
December 7, 2000

**Did we directly assist Peru in its capture of Shining Path leader Guzman?
Were we complicit in the purge of competing factions by Montesinos?**

- The capture of Shining Path leader Guzman was critical to defeating the insurgency and important to bringing peace and stability to Peru after over a decade of suffering from terrorist attacks at the hands of Guzman and his group.
- Beyond that, as you well know, we do not comment on intelligence matters.
- [IF PRESSED]: Well, you can always try the Agency and see if they would like to add anything.

VENEZUELA: CHAVEZ ON BOLIVIA AND ECUADOR
December 7, 2000

CONTEXT: State A/S for Latin America Pete Romero was quoted in the Miami Herald saying that there are indications of Chavez government support for violent indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador. Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez is upset over these remarks. Note to briefer: we want to avoid in a public shouting match on this issue.

Do you agree with A/S Romero's comments to the Miami Herald that there are indications of Chavez government support for violent indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador?

- Understand that the official quoted in the Miami Herald was not speaking on the record.
- The comment referred to reports from third parties, not reports from the U.S. government. We have seen those reports and are looking into them. We cannot confirm them at this time.
- We welcome the Venezuelan government's firm denial of these reports.
- We believe these issues are best dealt with bilaterally between Venezuela and the countries involved.

LIBERIA
December 7, 2000

Do you see Charles Taylor as the "wicked president" and the most serious destabilizing force in Africa?

- Yes.
- There is no doubt that Charles Taylor continues to willfully destabilize West Africa, particularly through his longstanding support for the rebels of the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone and his involvement in the arms and illegal diamond trades.
- Taylor has also done little for the people of Liberia or to lead Liberia's recovery from its own civil war.

LIBERIA VISA RESTRICTIONS
October 11, 2000

Why is the United States imposing visa restrictions on Liberia?

- President Taylor has defied the demands of the international community that he halt his support for the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone, and shows no signs of changing this behavior in the near future.
- Liberian government support for the RUF, and Liberian senior leaders' complicity in the weapons trafficking and illicit diamond trade that fuel the war in Sierra Leone, are of serious concern to the U.S. government. We have raised these concerns repeatedly with President Taylor and his ministers, including when Under Secretary of State Thomas Pickering met with President Taylor July 17 in Monrovia.
- In his discussions with President Taylor, Under Secretary Pickering noted that Liberia plays a significant role in Sierra Leone. In particular, Liberia has significant influence over the RUF. Rather than use that influence to end an insurgency that is devastating Sierra Leone, Liberia has become the primary patron and benefactor of the RUF.
- Under Secretary Pickering publicly advised President Taylor that the United States would impose sanctions on the Government of Liberia if Liberia did not cease activities that are fueling the conflict in Sierra Leone.

Liberia has promised to cooperate with investigations into illegal trading in diamonds and arms and asked for help to end the trade. Why are you punishing it?

- We are looking for immediate and effective action, not statements. The atrocities committed by the RUF are some of the most egregious human rights violations in the world. There will be no resolution of this conflict until Liberia ends its support for the RUF.
- Liberia needs a change in policy to end its involvement in the illegal diamonds and arms trade that has fueled the war in Sierra Leone. Liberia's leaders must make a genuine commitment to regional peace, and act accordingly. We will know when they have done so.

What must the government of Liberia do before you will review these sanctions?

- The United States expects President Taylor to immediately end Liberia's participation in illicit diamond and arms trading and use Liberia's influence with the RUF to restore peace and stability in Sierra Leone.
- Liberia must work constructively to help disarm and demobilize the rebels and help the government of Sierra Leone gain control over all its territory.

Against whom will the visa restrictions apply? Why were these individuals selected?

- These restrictions are aimed at persons who plan, engage in, or benefit from activities that support the RUF or that otherwise impede the peace process in Sierra Leone, and the spouses, children, and parents of such persons. These visa restrictions apply immediately to President Charles Taylor, senior members of the government of Liberia, their closest supporters, and their family members.

Why single out Liberia? Burkina Faso and other countries have been involved in illicit diamonds and arms trafficking.

- The proclamation is not limited to Liberians. It suspends the entry in to the United States of persons who plan, engage in, or benefit from activities that support the RUF or that otherwise impede the peace process in Sierra Leone, and the spouses, children, and parents of such persons. This suspension is not dependent on national origin.
- As we evaluate the available information, persons from countries other than Liberia may well be included in the visa ban.

What is involved in the visa restrictions?

- Section 212 (f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) authorizes the President to suspend the entry of a class of aliens if he "finds that the entry of (such) aliens ... would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."

- Peace and stability in Sierra Leone serve our interests. The Liberian government's active support for the RUF generates instability and violence, and therefore is counter to our interest.
- We will not permit Liberians who are working against our interests in Sierra Leone to enjoy the privilege of traveling to the United States.
- Senior Liberian officials and their families will be denied visas to enter the United States as long as this restriction is in force.

How do the restrictions work?

- Individuals and categories of persons falling within the scope of this proclamation will be identified, and their names will be communicated to all overseas posts. When these persons apply for visas, the State Department will supply necessary guidance to the consular officers who are adjudicating these visa applications.

Has this restriction been used before?

- Yes. In recent years, this authority has been used to suspend entry of certain Haitians, Zairians, Nigerians, and Liberians. It is now in effect for certain persons from Angola, Bosnia, Burma, Cuba, Sierra Leone, Sudan, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (except Montenegro).

Are some Sierra Leoneans barred under this restriction?

- This restriction could be applied to any Sierra Leonean who impedes the peace process.
- There is an existing proclamation under which officials of the junta that overthrew the elected government of President Kabbah in 1997 are barred from entry into the United States. (Elected civilian government was restored by Nigerian-led West African regional forces in 1998.)

How long will the visa restrictions remain in place?

- Until the Secretary of State decides they are no longer needed. Clearly, the Liberian government must stop supporting the RUF and cease its involvement in weapons trafficking and illicit diamonds trading, at a minimum.

What specific steps do we expect Taylor to take, and when?

- We have long urged the Liberian government to take steps to end support for the RUF. We are closely monitoring the situation, and we will know when this condition has been fulfilled.

Taylor has asked for evidence tying him to these activities. What evidence do you have?

- Under Secretary Pickering assured President Taylor that he and the U.S. government had carefully reviewed the evidence and were satisfied of its accuracy.

Why are you targeting families?

- Our goal is to change Liberian policy and practice. We are withdrawing the privileges of travel to the United States from all those – officials and their families – who may support and/or profit from the current policy of fostering conflict in Sierra Leone. We want President Taylor, his advisors, and their associates to know that they will pay a personal price, and we hope their family members will join us in encouraging them to stop their support for the RUF.

Is the United States alone in imposing visa restrictions?

- We are consulting with other states in the region and in Europe to broaden the travel ban, which would increase the pressure on the Liberian government to change its policy.

Are there more restrictions pending? If so, what are they?

- We are hopeful that further measures will not be necessary, but we are considering further measures in the event that the Liberian government does not change its policy.

(If asked) What measures are you contemplating?

- We will not comment on future U.S. policy options. These will be announced at the appropriate time, and only if they are needed.

(If asked) How will these new visa sanctions affect Liberian here with Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) status? Will you extend DED, or support legislation to grant relief to Liberian immigrants who are long-term residents of the United States?

- The possible effect of visa sanction on those with DED status is under consideration. We would consider some mechanism to grant relief to those Liberians who have been longstanding residents of the United States.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 11, 2000

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

LIBERIA: VISA RESTRICTIONS

I have signed a proclamation suspending the entry into the United States, as immigrants and non-immigrants, of all persons - and the spouses, children, and parents of all persons - who plan, engage in, or benefit from activities that support the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), or that otherwise impede the peace process in Sierra Leone. These visa restrictions will immediately apply to President Charles Taylor, senior members of the Government of Liberia, their closest supporters, and their family members.

I call upon the Liberian government to end immediately Liberia's trafficking in weapons and illicit diamonds that fuel the war in Sierra Leone, and instead to use its influence with the RUF to restore peace and stability to Sierra Leone. Members of my Administration have repeatedly made this request of President Taylor. The absence of any positive response from his government leaves us little choice but to impose these restrictions. Only when the Government of Liberia ends its participation in activities that support the RUF, will the United States review this policy.

#

ETHIOPIA-ERITREA
December 4, 2000

BACKGROUND: The U.S. played a prominent role on mediating between Eritrea and Ethiopia, and has worked closely with the OAU to achieve an end to the war since it began on May 6, 1998. A formal Cessation of Hostilities Agreement, brokered by the U.S. and the OAU, was signed by the governments of Eritrea and Ethiopia on June 18, 2000. The UN then began to deploy a peacekeeping mission (UNMEE) to the border, and appointed an SRSG who is now in place. Since the Cessation agreement was signed, the U.S. hosted technical talks in Washington in July, joined the Algerian government for proximity talks in Algiers, and undertook two rounds of shuttle diplomacy between the Ethiopian and Eritrean capitals, led by former NSA Tony Lake. President Isaias and Prime Minister Meles individually confirmed to President Clinton last week that they accepted the text of a final peace agreement sent to them by the US and Algerian envoys on November 21. President Clinton's letter served to confirm to each leader that the other had, indeed, agreed to the text.

It is important that Jake use the specific words underlined below - reason being that one of the parties has to submit the agreement to its parliament (although the leadership has agreed).

Is there a peace agreement between Eritrea and Ethiopia?

- President Clinton wrote to President Isaias (Eritrea) and Prime Minister Meles (Ethiopia) on Friday to confirm that he had heard from both of them **that they accept the text of a final peace agreement** between their two countries.
- The Algerian government has invited both **leaders** to attend a formal signing ceremony in Algiers on December 12. We **expect** that both leaders will attend.
- The agreement provides for mechanisms for the delimitation and demarcation of the border and for the settling of compensation claims.
- President Clinton has been actively engaged in efforts to mediate this conflict since it began over two years ago. He personally brokered an air moratorium during the early stages of the fighting, and has communicated with both leaders on numerous occasions. His envoy, former National Security Advisor Anthony

Lake, has undertaken eight rounds of shuttle diplomacy between the Ethiopian and Eritrean capitals, and five trips to Algiers to work with the Algerian government, which has been mediating on behalf of the Organization of Africa Unity.

- The UN peacekeeping mission, UNMEE, is now deploying, and last week opened the first of several land corridors between the two countries. Following a successful meeting of the Military Coordination Commission in Nairobi over the weekend, we expect more corridors to be opened.

DRAFT
ICC NEGOTIATIONS
December 7, 2000

BACKGROUND: The U.S. delegation to the current Preparatory Commission on the International Criminal Court (ICC) in New York has attempted to minimize press exposure, because a high profile would inflame critics of the “fix” we have proposed to protect U.S. equities. A number of competing proposals are currently in play – including the proposal about which Barbara Crossette writes in today’s New York Times (a proposal that would extend to states that sign, but have not yet ratified the Treaty, the privilege of a “Seven Year Opt Out” from the Treaty’s war crimes provisions, which states parties currently enjoy under the Treaty.) We should not speculate on how this proposal or any of the others that are in play – might turn out.

What is the status of negotiations on the International Criminal Court (ICC)?

- The United Nations ICC Preparatory Commission meeting from November 27 through December 8. This session will focus on the relationship agreement between the court and the United Nations and other issues.

Is the U.S. looking for a France-like exemption?

- There are a number of proposals at play in these negotiations.
- Our goal is to make sure the ICC’s aims – holding accountable perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes – do not conflict with the critical role of nations like the United States in maintaining and restoring international peace and security.
- The issue is the willingness of non-party states (like the U.S.) to remain engaged in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations.

What is the U.S. position on the ICC?

- The United States has long supported the goal of a permanent international criminal court, but the 1998 Rome Treaty contains serious flaws that we are working to resolve.
- We sincerely hope that governments can arrive at a mutually acceptable arrangement.

(If asked:) Will the U.S. announce at the meeting that it will sign the ICC Treaty?

- There is no plan by the administration to make any statement whatsoever about signature of the ICC Treaty.

“DON’T ASK, DON’T TELL”

December 7, 2000

BACKGROUND: The “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy is a compromise solution. While it has been difficult to implement it has achieved one of its goals, which was to reduce harassment

Core Points:

- Any type of harassment within any of the Services is unacceptable. The Administration is committed to eliminating harassment and ensuring the proper implementation of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy.
- The Working Group that Secretary Cohen convened to examine the FT Campbell investigation earlier this year developed an action plan that Secretary Cohen accepted in its entirety. This plan is now in the process of being implementing. The report’s recommendations represents a significant step forward in ensuring a military environment free of harassment. These recommendations build on Secretary Cohen’s earlier directives on training and the importance of leadership, and will continue to improve the implementation of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy.

“President Clinton has labeled DADT ‘dumb ass’, the Pentagon has said the policy is working. Who is right?”

- The current DADT policy is a compromise solution. It has been a difficult compromise to implement and is not completely satisfactory to the President nor to the Pentagon. However, one of its main objectives, to abolish harassment, is working. Secretary Cohen has been very aggressive in dealing with the issue of harassment and is in the process of implementing an action plan that came out of his working group that examined the FT Campbell report earlier this year. We are clearly satisfied that these initiatives are a positive step forward.